2.17.27.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Rev. Wm. B. Scarborough.

Division BS525

Section .D25

V. 2.

Copy 1

Wm B. Scarborough

A TREATISE

ON

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

VOLUME II.

Id praecipue officio meo contineri existimavi, ut adulescentes probos et candidos, in quorum studiis fortuna ac spes ecclesiae et litterarum posita est, ea docerem quae multo labore et anxia sedulitate quaesita viderer mihi quam verissima repperisse; non ut illi me tamquam ducem sectarentur aut in his quae tradidissem adquiescerent, sed singula ut ipsi investigarent, investigata perpenderent, perpensa probarent corrigerent augerent.—Lachmann.

A

TREATISE

ON

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

EXHIBITING

A SYSTEMATIC VIEW OF THAT SCIENCE.

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE, AND LL.D.

VOLUME II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BOSTON:

GOULD AND LINCOLN, 59 WASHINGTON STREET.

MDCCCLIII.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER I.

Page

Nature of the New Testament Language 1

CHAPTER II.

History of the Text 13

CHAPTER III.

Causes of Various Readings 23

CHAPTER IV.

The New Testament Canon 30

CHAPTER V.

History of the Text till the middle of the Third Century . . . 39

CHAPTER VI.

History of the Text after the middle of the Third Century . . . 67

CHAPTER VII.

Modes of Classifying the New Testament Documents, and their Critical Application 88

CHAPTER VIII.

Page
History of the Printed Text 106

CHAPTER IX.

History of the Printed Text (continued) 121

CHAPTER X.

Ancient Versions—the Peshito 150

CHAPTER XI.

The Philoxenian Version 185

CHAPTER XII.

Other Syriac Versions 195

CHAPTER XIII.

Æthiopic and Egyptian Versions 202

CHAPTER XIV.

Armenian Version 215

CHAPTER XV.

Georgian and other Versions 221

CHAPTER XVI.

Gothic Version 230

CHAPTER XVII.

Slavonic Version 238

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Latin Version 241

CHAPTER XIX.

Page

MSS. of the Greek Testament 262

CHAPTER XX.

Description of the Uncial MSS. 271

CHAPTER XXI.

Cursive MSS. 318

CHAPTER XXII.

Evangelistaria and Lectionaria 325

CHAPTER XXIII.

General Observations on MSS. 328

CHAPTER XXIV.

Quotations of the New Testament in Ancient Writers 335

CHAPTER XXV.

Extracts from the New Testament in Latin writers 354

CHAPTER XXVI.

Critical Conjecture 371

CHAPTER XXVII.

Critical Rules 374

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Critical Examination of Passages 382

ERRATA, CORRECTIONS, AND ADDITIONS.

The reader is particularly requested to correct the following *errata*, as well as to peruse the *additional* explanations and remarks.

VOL. II.

Page 12, at the end add: "The Rev. R. Scott, one of the authors of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, is also preparing a Greek dictionary to the New Testament and LXX."

Page 15, line 13, for ΚΑΓΟΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΓΟΥΣ, read ΚΑΛΟΔΙΔΑΣ-ΚΑΛΟΥΣ.

Page 16, line 24, for "cod. Vatican of Matthaei," read "cod V. of Matthaei."

Page 17, at the end add: "The codex Ephraemi and other MSS. shew what kind of divisions preceded *στίχοι*. In that MS. a dot is found very frequently where a *στίχος* afterwards ended. The stichometrical division seems to have been the same among the Greeks and Latins, as may be seen from the codex *Amiatinus*."

——— line 9, after "*beside* the letters," add "*Postscribed iota* is common in inscriptions and in all uncial MSS. except such as are Biblical. The only trace of iota *subscribed* or *postscribed* which Dr. Tregelles remembers to have seen in a Biblical uncial MS. is in U *once*, where ῶι (ῷ) occurs. But the iota must have been *understood* in such MSS., else copyists could not have interchanged the terminations ῳ and οι, for example, Δω and δοι."

Page 19, line 6 from bottom, after "Sunday" put in brackets [week], for σάββατον does not mean *Sunday*, as Marsh says, but *week*.

Page 36, line 16, after "all the present books," add "*except the Apocalypse*."

Page 75, line 5 from bottom, for "of the Apocalypse D. E." read "of the Acts of the Apostles D. E."

Page 83, line 20, after "cursive ones," insert these words—"this division, in which A. B. C. D. *E. F. G.* belong together, is confined of course to the MSS. so denoted in Paul's epistles."

Page 109, line 8, for "the Latin Vulgate," read "a Latin translation partly based on the Vulgate."

Page 110, line 23, after "Apocalypse alone," add "this edition contains the Vulgate as well as his own Latin version."

Page 121, line 3, instead of "the text is that of Stephens' third edition," read "the text fluctuates between the Elzevir and that in the third edition of Stephens."

Page 124, last line, for "upwards of 40 codices were collated by him for the first time, or for the first time *properly*," read "a goodly number of MSS. were collated by him, but for the most part *cursorily*."

Page 125, line 22, for "threefold," read "fourfold."

——— After line 25, insert "Prolegomena also precede the Acts and Catholic epistles."

Page 140, expunge the first paragraph, and read instead the following:—"The text of the *small* edition is wholly based on *oriental* (in his sense) sources, and where these differ among themselves, he adopts the readings 'quae Italorum et Afrorum consensu comprobarentur.' In his *large* edition, he uses the combined evidence of *eastern* (in his sense) and *western* authorities. In the latter his only MSS." &c. &c. (as in the second paragraph).

Page 141, expunge the second paragraph on the page.

Page 142, line 18, expunge all that is on this page, beginning with "one or two authorities," &c. &c. and read thus—"Very few authorities are all that is available in certain cases. In one instance at least De Wette thinks that his plan gives a senseless reading. See Matt. xxi. 28-31. But Lachmann denies the allegation. His reply may be seen in vol. ii. pp. 5, 6, of the preface. Tregelles also justifies the reading in opposition to De Wette. Of course the mere mistakes of the few ancient copies on which he relies are given in his text, such as τὴν without ἀγαπὴν in Ephes. i. 15, and εἰ μὴν for ἢ μὴν in Heb. vi. 14. We do not find fault with him for such mistakes, since, in exhibiting them in his text, he follows out his plan according to which he furnished a *contribution* to serve as *part of a basis* for a pure text. His principle is *meant* to exclude subjectiveness and caprice."

Page 162, line 8, after "Persian," put "and Armenian."

Page 169, lines, 17 and 18. It must not be supposed, from the statement here made, that the passage John vii. 53—viii. 11 is given at

length among the errata. *Deest historia adulteræ* is all that is given in Latin in the Syriac page. And for typographical errors "at the end," read "at the beginning."

Page 178, line 11. We learn from Dr. Tregelles, that Dr. Lee's edition of the Syriac New Testament was not commenced by Dr. Buchanan. The latter indeed had begun an edition for the British and Foreign Bible Society which was printed as far as the Acts when he died. But it was thought desirable to cancel the sheets; because of the very peculiar system of orthography and vocalisation adopted. Hence the Gospels and Acts were *reprinted* from Buchanan's text; and the text of the rest of the New Testament was formed by Lee on Buchanan's system.

Page 180, first and following lines. Instead of "In Schaaf's edition, and as Hug states, in all printed editions and MSS., the reading is, 'for God himself, by his grace, tasted death for all.' But in the edition before us, the words are, 'but he himself, by the grace of God, tasted death for all,' and so it is in the Malabar MS. This agrees with the Greek, and shews no improper alteration of the original after the doctrinal tenets of the Jacobites," read as follows: "In the editions of Widmanstadt, Schaaf, and most others, the reading is, 'for God himself, by his grace, tasted death for all.' But Hug is incorrect in saying that this is the reading of all printed editions; for in Tremellius's, which follows the Heidelberg MS., the reading corresponds to the Greek χωρὶς θεοῦ, viz. ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. In the edition before us, there is a third form of the passage, viz. 'He, by his grace, God, for every man hath tasted death.' ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܒܛܝܒܘܬܗ ܐܠܗܐ. Here there is merely a transposition of words, the sense being still the Jacobite reading first given by Widmanstadt."

Page 182. Insert at the fifth line from bottom: "It must be admitted that the collation of Greenfield's text with Lee's is very inaccurately printed. But for this Dr. Henderson is responsible, since *he* made the list from Greenfield's notes. There can be no question that it is badly done."

——— last line. Instead of saying that 1 John v. 7 is "put in brackets," it should be stated that it is "omitted," and the verses are numbered 6, 8, 9, &c.

Page 232, line 4 from bottom, for, "it was transmitted during a war in the seventeenth century to Prague, for security," read "it was taken to Prague."

Page 234, line 1, for "La Croze, Wetstein, and Michaelis," read "La Croze and Wetstein."

Page 249, lines 6 and 7, for "bishop of," read "rhetorician at."

Page 273, line 11, for "afterwards," read "previously."

Page 275, line 9, for "209," read "1209."

Page 295, lines 11 and 12, for "where the MS. itself is deposited, having been presented by Archbishop Laud in 1715 8vo," read "where the MS. itself is deposited having been presented by Archbishop Laud, in 1715 8vo."

Page 296, line 3 from bottom, for "In the time of Wetstein it began with Matt. vii. 6—viii. 34, and ended with John xiii. 34," read, "A collation of this MS. which had been made long before, was used by Wetstein. It began with Matt. vii. 6—viii. 34, and ended with John xiii. 34. The codex has many chasms now, several of which did not exist at the time when the collation used by Wetstein was made."

Page 297, lines 3 and 4 from bottom, for "now in the Benedictine Library of St. Germain des Prez," read "now in the Bibliotheque du Roi."

Page 298, lines 5 and 6 from bottom, for "because the Latin precedes the Greek column, and the *Anglo-Saxon* formation," read "because the Anglo-Saxon formation of the" &c.

Page 310, line 18, for "Matt." read "John."

——— line 3 from bottom, for "public library," read "University Library."

Page 319, line 9, for "It has been collated by Wetstein, Griesbach, Begtrup, in part, and by Scholz, entirely, as he says. But," read "It was collated by Larroque."

Page 319, line 24, after "Jackson," insert "The text is *sui generis*, having been transcribed from some older MS. in which entire leaves were wanting."

Page 323, line 1, after "could," insert "He supposes that it once preceded a MS. of Chrysostom's homilies on the epistle to the Hebrews."

——— line 3, after "Tischendorf," put "But the letters are not properly cursive."

——— line 11, after "codex," add, "Both are written in red ink."

Page 376, line 2 from bottom, omit the words "from the Vulgate."

Page 340, lines 11 and 12, No. 28 is omitted. No. 29 should be 28, &c. &c.

Page 354, line 7, for "Vienna," read "Vienne."

Page 356, lines 17 and 18, No. 14 is omitted. No. 15 should be 14, &c. &c.

Page 401, note, for "Spracidioms," read "Sprachidioms."

Page 422, line 7. Instead of "this Cambridge MS. (codex Bezae) and β of Stephens are identical," read "this Cambridge MS. (Kk. 6. 4. olim. Vatabli) and $\iota\gamma$ of Stephens are identical."

CHAPTER I.

NATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE.

PRELIMINARY.

In discussing the sources of criticism by which the New Testament text is rectified and restored, we shall follow as closely as is convenient the order pursued in the case of the Old Testament.

They are,

I. Ancient versions.
II. Manuscripts.
III. Quotations.
IV. Critical conjecture.

Before giving a history of the text itself, which claims our first notice, it will be desirable to speak of the language in which the New Testament books are written.

The reason why the New Testament books were written in the Greek language is obvious. It was most widely spread over the then civilised world, and was therefore best adapted for the instruction of all. It was most readily understood by the greatest number of persons. When our Lord appeared in the flesh, the Greek tongue was current in Palestine itself. It

was the book-language of the Egyptian *Jews*, and of all others not Palestinian. Hence the apostles were under the necessity of using it in their preaching and writing, when they went forth from Palestine to promulgate that new religion with whose propagation they were entrusted. The sacred authors composed the records of Christianity in a language extensively diffused, and more readily apprehended than any other.

In considering the nature of the New Testament diction, it is almost superfluous to remark, that it differs from the classical language of Greece. It presents indeed a marked contrast to the flowing style of the celebrated Grecian authors in the days of their prosperity and freedom. Let us therefore examine its characteristic elements, that we may clearly perceive how appropriate a vehicle it has been for the truths of Christianity.

Its constituent elements may be regarded as three, viz. The Greek, the Jewish, and the Christian.

1. The old Greek language had its various dialects, of which four have been distinguished. The oldest of these was the Æolic, of which we have few remains, prevailing in Thessaly and Bœotia, Lesbos, and the north-western coasts of Asia Minor. The Doric proceeding from Doris spread over the greatest part of the Peloponnesus, lower Italy and Sicily. It was somewhat harsh, and abounded in the use of long *a*. The Ionic was originally spoken in Attica. But the colonies sent out thence to the coasts of Asia Minor soon surpassed the mother tribe in improvement; and therefore the name *Ionic* came to be applied exclusively to *their* dialect. From its numerous vowels, this dialect is the softest of all. The Attic was used by such of the Ionians as remained in Attica after the colonies had emigrated to Asia Minor. This last soon excelled all the rest in refinement, holding as it did a middle place between the harsh roughness of the Doric and the softness of the Ionic. Thus the Doric and Ionic were the principal dialects, to which the rest have been sometimes reduced, the

Æolic being reckoned a branch of the former, and the Attic of the latter.

At the time of Philip of Macedon, the Attic had become the most general, having attained to a completeness and range far beyond the other dialects. Under a combination of peculiar influences it had taken the lead of all. Among the dialects of the different peoples it became the favourite one. It began indeed to be employed almost exclusively. And when different writers adopted it, they mingled with it much that was derived from the dialect of their own district or region. Hence it was modified and altered. The departures from Attic purity thus introduced by tribes who had before used distinct dialects contributed to the gradual decay of genuine Attic. This change was brought about mainly by the Macedonian conquest. When Greece was deprived of its liberty, it was an unavoidable consequence that those tribes who were hitherto distinct in manners, and in some measure independent of one another, should come to use one language. The loss of their freedom was the *chief* cause of the intermingling of dialects and their consequent corruption. Though the amalgamation had commenced by previous intercourse among the several republics of Greece, yet it was greatly promoted under the reign of Philip, so that the former dialectic peculiarities of the language no longer appeared. In this mixture of dialects that of Macedonia came to have a certain predominance, from its being spoken by the people who had obtained the sovereignty. The language of the conquerors diffused among the subject tribes prevailed to a considerable extent. Thus after the Macedonian dominion, there was a mixture of various elements. The διάλεκτος κοινή or Ἑλληνική was formed. Attic purity degenerated. The Greek language losing many of its features by the admixture of elements borrowed from other dialects than the Attic, by the changes which are unavoidably produced in the progress of time, and by the influence of the Macedonian

conquest, was modified and altered. It was *the common* language or dialect; and accordingly the writers of this later period were denominated *οἱ κοινοί* or *οἱ Ἕλληνες*, in contrast with the genuine Attics. Still it continued to be *substantially* the Attic; for the chief characteristic of that dialect remained, notwithstanding the various modifications introduced. The *κοινὴ διάλεκτος* is the usual standard of grammars and Lexicons, departures from it being specified under the name of particular dialects.

In the colonies established by Alexander and his successors, where the Greek inhabitants collected from every people had lost their own dialects, the same *common* language prevailed. In Egypt especially, where literature was cultivated with much zeal, the influence of the Macedonian conquest was felt. At Alexandria, the chief seat of such influence, the *common* language was developed and modified by the circumstances of the inhabitants and the places whence many of them had come.

It will be seen from this brief account that *the common* or *Hellenic* language employed after the time of Alexander had the Attic dialect for its basis. The Attic element was still observable, though the former purity and elegance of that dialect were in a great measure lost. Even before the subjugation of Greece it had begun to degenerate, when different writers conformed to it because it was reckoned the most polished. Others were absorbed into it, for each tribe in adopting it naturally introduced many foreign idioms. And when we reflect on the conquests of the Macedonians, it is certain that their language had a great influence in modifying the later diction which had arisen from the amalgamation of diverse dialects. This predominant influence was most observable at Alexandria.

Another element of the New Testament language is the *Jewish*. The writers were Jews by birth—familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures and ideas. The idiom of the language in

which those sacred books were written was not remote from their habits of expression. They were accustomed to speak Aramaean or Syro-Chaldaic, which was current in Palestine, and learned Greek from intercourse with others, in part perhaps from the Septuagint. And when a foreigner learns another language he has for a time to think in his own, so that his conceptions are Jewish, though clothed in the costume of the language he has acquired. Now the outward complexion of thought is influenced by its peculiar nature. The latter modifies the forms as well as the proper construction of words. Hence the diction of the New Testament partakes of a Hebrew colouring, arising from the fact that the writers were Hebrews accustomed to speak the Aramaean or later Hebrew, and in some instances acquainted with the ancient language of the Scriptures. Their vernacular tongue influenced the mode of exhibiting their conceptions.

Thus various Hebrew influences contributed to the present form of the New Testament diction. The Old Testament Scriptures had some direct bearing on it. They had also a greater *indirect* power over it, through the Septuagint version. And then the Aramaean, current, dialect of Palestine exerted its influence at the same time.

A third element may be characterised as *the Christian* element, which lies in *the subjects* to which the Greek language was applied. The existing vocabulary had no terms to express many ideas which the sacred writers were prompted to communicate. No native Greek had ever written on Christianity. They were the first who were authorised to make known in writing a revelation of mercy and grace. The doctrines of the new religion had not yet been divulged in their full import. When therefore native Hebrews were commissioned to write about Christianity in the Greek tongue, they had ideas for which that tongue furnished no appropriate terms. The subjects were new. Hence it became necessary

either to employ words already existing in new senses, or to make entirely new ones. Accordingly both expedients were adopted by these Jewish authors and teachers of the new religion.

Thus the Christian element of the New Testament diction arose from the subjects on which that diction was employed, and the nature of the ideas to be expressed. We need not therefore be surprised that the Greek language received many modifications from *the exigency of the case*. The theological element must be taken along with others as pervading and influencing the Greek of the New Testament.

If the representation now given be correct, it will be seen that there are various sources whence an accurate knowledge of the New Testament language should be sought.

There are first the writers called the οἱ κοινοί, among whom are Aristotle, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, and others.

In relation to the second element, it is necessary to consult the Alexandrine version and the apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments. The former was made under the influence of circumstances to which the New Testament writers were exposed. The Jews at Alexandria had to acquire by conversation the Greek language current in that city. Into it they translated the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and thus their version exhibits an imperfect knowledge of a foreign language pervaded by a Hebrew influence. Accustomed to the Jewish Scriptures, and having had the Aramaean for their vernacular tongue, the words and phrases of the Greek which they had learned were tinged with Jewish idioms and peculiarities. The translators had to coin new words, or to use existing ones in new senses; because the subjects of which the Old Testament treats were in a great measure unknown to the Greeks. Many ideas required for their expression appropriate terms which the compass of the Greek tongue did not

furnish. Thus the Septuagint exhibits the same idioms with the New Testament. The only difference is that in it the Hebraisms are more strongly marked, because it is a direct translation from a Hebrew original.

The apocryphal writings of the Old Testament also afford illustrations of the New Testament diction. They were written by Jews on Jewish affairs. And the apocryphal works belonging to the New Testament were frequently imitations of the latter, and consequently illustrate its diction.

With respect to the works of Josephus and Philo, they afford less aid in explaining the idiom of the Septuagint and New Testament, because, though contemporary with the apostles, they were able to overcome the influence of their vernacular tongue, and to write in a style nearer that of the later Greek than what appears in the New Testament. Their language is much more remote from the colloquial dialect of the common people than that of the New Testament writers; for the latter is the diction of ordinary intercourse rather than of books. The Hebrew idiom however is apparent in these two authors, though in a far less degree than in the sacred writers.

I. According to the representation now given, the ground-element of the New Testament diction is the later Greek in that peculiar form of it which arose as the language of intercourse in which the peculiarities of the different dialects hitherto separated were mixed together, with the Macedonian element particularly prominent. The peculiarities of this ground-element are either *lexical* or *grammatical*, the former being more prominent.

1. *Lexical* peculiarities. We are prepared to find in it words and forms of words belonging to *all* the dialects, especially the Attic, as ὕαλος, Rev. xxi. 18, 21; φιάλη, Rev. v. 8, ἀετός, Matt. xxiv. 28; ἀλήθω, Matt. xxiv. 41; Luke xvii.

35, *ὁ σκότος*, *πρύμνα*, *ἵλεως*. To the Doric belong *πιάζω*, John vii. 30; *κλίβανος*, Matt. vi. 30; *ἡ λιμός*, *ποία*. To the Ionic belong *γογγύζω*, *ἐήσσω*, *πρηνής*, *βαθμός*, *σκορπίζω*. *φύω* intransit. is both Ionic and Doric. To the Macedonian may be assigned *παρεμβολή*, *ἐύμη*. Thus we have found vestiges of all the dialects except the Æolic, which had probably fallen into disuse as the language of ordinary life before any of the other dialects.

Again, words or word-formations which were rare in ancient Greek, or were used only by poets, came into common use or passed over into prose, ex. gr. *αὐθεντέω*, *μεσονύκτιον*, *ἀλάλητος*, *ἔσθησις*, *ἀλέκτωρ*, *βρέχω*, to *irrigate*. *Κοράσιον*, on the contrary, passed out of common life into the speech peculiar to writing.

Farther, words received a new form, mostly an enlarged or prolonged one, ex. gr. *μετωικεσία*, *ἱκεσία*, *ἀνάθεμα* (*ἀνάθημα*), *γενέσια* (*γενέθλια*), *γλωσσόκομον* (*γλωσσοκομεῖον*), *ἔκπαλαι* (*πάλαι*), *ἐχθές* (*χθές*), *ἐξάπινα* (*ἐξαπίνης*), *αἴτημα* (*αἴτησις*), *ψεῦσμα* (*ψεῦδος*), *ἀπάντησις* (*ἀπάντημα*), *καύχησις* (*καύχημα*), *λυχνία* (*λυχνίον*), *ὀπτασία* (*ὄψις*), *συγκυρία* (*συγκύρησις*), *μελίσσιος* (*μελίσσειος*), *ἀποστασία* (*ἀπόστασις*), *βασίλισσα* (*βασίλεια*), *ἐκχύνω* (*ἐκχέω*), *στήκω*, *ἐλεεινος* (*ἐλεινός*), *νοσσιά* (*νεοσσιά*), *πετάομαι* (*πέτομαι*), *οἰκοδομή* (*οἰκοδόμησις*), *ἐξυπνίζω* (*ἀφυπνίζω*), *δεκατόω* (*δεκατεύω*), *ἀροτριάω* (*ἀρόω*), *βιβλαρίδιον* (*βιβλίδιον*), *ὠτάριον*, *ψιχίον* (*ψίξ*), *νουθεσία* (*νουθέτησις*), *καταποντίζω* (*καταποντόω*), *μοιχαλίς*, *ψιθυριστής*, *ἀργός* of two terminations, *ὀμνύω* for *ὄμνυμι*, *ξυράω* for *ξυρέω*, *βαρέω* for *βαρύνω*, *σαρόω* for *σαίρω*, *χολάω* for *χολόομαι*, &c.

Again, words known to the ancient language received new meanings, ex. gr. *παρακαλέω to ask*, *παιδεύω to chastise*, *εὐχαριστέω to give thanks*, *ἀνακλίνω*, *ἀναπίπτω*, *ἀνακεῖμαι*, *to recline at table*, *ἀποκρίνομαι to answer*, *ἀποτάσσομαι to renounce or bid farewell to*, *συγκρίνω to compare*, *ξύλον living tree*, *ἀναστροφή life*, *κεφαλίς volume or book*, *εὐσχήμων a distinguished one*, *ὀψώνιον wages*,

ὀψάριον *fish*, ἐρεύγομαι *to utter*, περισπάομαι *to be distracted with business*, πτῶμα *corpse*, σχολή *school*, &c.

Still further, new words were formed chiefly by composition, ex. gr. as ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, μονόφθαλμος, αἱματεκχυσία, ἀνταποκρίνομαι, ἀγαθουργέω, &c. Special attention is due to a class of nouns ending in μα as κατάλυμα, ἀνταπόδομα, κατόρθωμα, ἐμπίσμα, γέννημα, ἔκτρωμα, βάπτισμα; to nouns in συν, as συμμαθητής, συμπολίτης; adjectives in ινος, as ὄρθρινος, ὄψινος, πρώϊνος, καθημερινός, ὀστράκινος; verbs in οω and ιζω, as ἀνακοινόω, ἀφυπνόω, ὁλιόω, ἐξουδενόω, ὀρθρίζω, δειγματίζω, θεατρίζω; new forms of adverbs, ex. gr. πάντοτε, παιδιόθεν, καθώς, πανοικί.*

2. *Grammatical* peculiarities.

These are confined for the most part to the forms of nouns and verbs which were quite unknown before, or not used in certain words, or foreign to the Attic book-language. The use of the *dual* is rare. With respect to *syntax*, the later Greek has little that is peculiar. There are some examples of verbs construed with other cases than such as had been used before; of conjunctions elsewhere joined with the optative or subjunctive, connected with the indicative. The use of the optative, especially in oblique speech, seldom occurs.

II. By the Jewish element we are prepared, in the second place, to look for Hebrew modifications in the Greek language of the New Testament, because the Hebrew, or more properly the Aramaean, was the vernacular tongue of the writers.

Hebraisms are divided into two classes, *perfect and imperfect*. The former include words, phrases, and constructions that have no parallels in the native Greek, and are therefore entirely moulded after the Hebrew. *Imperfect* Hebraisms consist of words, phrases, and constructions which have some parallel in the Greek, but were more probably derived from the Hebrew.

* See Winer's Grammatik, u. s. w. p. 24, et seq. fourth edition.

Examples of *perfect* Hebraism are σπλαγχνίζομαι *to have compassion*, from σπλάγχνα *bowels*, related in the same way as רַחֲמִים and רֶחֶם. Ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι, πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν from נָשָׂא פָּנִים, πλατύνειν τὴν καρδίαν, πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω, οὐ . . . . . πᾶς for οὐδείς, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι ἐν τινί, ἁμαρτάνειν ἐνώπιον, οἰκοδομεῖν *to edify*.

Imperfect Hebraisms are such as εἷς *one* for πρῶτος; σπέρμα *offspring*, from זֶרַע; γλῶσσα for *nation*, from לָשׁוֹן; ἀνάγκη *trouble*, from צַר; εἰς ἀπάντησιν *to meet*, from לִקְרַאת; πέρατα τῆς γῆς, from אַפְסֵי הָאָרֶץ; χεῖλος *shore*, Hebrew שָׂפָה. Though these expressions have probably parallels in Greek, they appear to be derived from the Hebrew, since they occur but seldom in the former language.

The contest formerly carried on for years respecting the character of the New Testament diction is now matter of history. Some writers laboured to prove that it possessed the purity and correctness of the old Attic language. These were termed *purists*, who strove with ill-judged zeal to shew that the New Testament exhibits the genuine Attic idiom unadulterated by Hebraisms. Conceiving that all departures from this standard were blemishes or imperfections in the sacred text, they endeavoured to banish Hebraised phrases entirely from the New Testament, as though the language should be disfigured by them. Pfochen was the first who undertook to shew that all the expressions found in the New Testament occur in classic Greek authors; and he was followed by numerous writers on the same side.

On the other hand, many undertook to prove that the diction, so far from exhibiting Attic purity, abounded everywhere in Hebraisms. This party ultimately triumphed, though they pushed their view to an unwarrantable extent, calling many expressions Hebraistic which were not so. The truth lies between the two parties. It is now universally acknowledged that *the thoughts* are Hebrew but *the costume* Greek. The con-

ceptions are such as *Jews* would employ under the influence of the Spirit; while the dress in which they are clothed is the Greek language then current. There is a Hebrew colouring that cannot be mistaken, though Hebraisms are not so abundant as the Hellenists in their controversies with the Purists frequently supposed.*

III. We are prepared by *the Christian* or *ecclesiastical* element to find words already existing in the vocabulary of the Greeks employed in a new sense, or new ones framed to express ideas for which no corresponding terms existed before. Thus, πίστις, ἔργα, δικαιοῦσθαι, ἐκλέγεσθαι, δικαιοσύνη, προσωποληψία *partiality*, ἀντίλυτρον *ransom*, οἱ ἅγιοι, ἀπόστολος, βάπτισμα, &c. The Greek language had not been employed on the subjects to which the New Testament writers applied it, especially *religious* topics; and they were therefore obliged either to employ terms already in use in a sense foreign to their classical one, or to make new words for the purpose.

According to Jerome there are *Cilicisms* in Paul's epistles, that is, peculiarities belonging to the language of Cilicia which was the apostle's birth-place. He instances four such,† viz. ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας, 1 Corinth. iv. 3, *by man's judgment*; ἀνθρώπινον λέγω, ep. to Romans vi. 19, *I speak after the manner of men*; οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν, *I was not burdensome to you*, 2 Corinth. xii. 13; μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω, *let no one defraud you*, Colos. ii. 18. It is doubtful whether these should be regarded as idioms transferred from the Cilician dialect, notwithstanding the affirmation of Jerome. They are perhaps terms and phrases of unusual occurrence belonging to the later Greek.

As to *the name* of the New Testament and Septuagint Greek, it has been called *Hellenistic*, because the Jews who spoke Greek are called *Hellenists* in the New Testament (Acts

* See Winer, p. 14, et seq.

† Ad Algasiam quaest 10. Opp. vol. iv. p. 204, ed. Martianay.

vi. 1). This appellation is not appropriate. The designation *Hebrew-Greek* or *Jewish-Greek* is more suitable, *i.e.* Greek with a strong colouring of Hebrew.

In recent times the nature of the Greek diction peculiar to the Greek Testament has been fundamentally investigated, and its general features systematised by Winer in his invaluable grammar. Good lexicons of it have also appeared from Wahl, Bretschneider, and Wilke. That of Robinson is on the whole the best for English readers, especially in the last edition. It is still susceptible, however, of much improvement. Should Winer publish his long contemplated dictionary, it will doubtless supersede all others, for in this department he has no rival.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT.

This may be divided into two parts, History of its external form; and History of the text itself.

1. The autographs of the New Testament books have perished irrecoverably. Hence we are left to investigate the text with such aids as ancient history and documents may supply.

What *material* the writers made use of can only be conjectured. It has been thought that it was Egyptian paper, or the papyrus. Afterwards the hides of animals were used for the purpose, parchment, glazed cotton paper, and linen rag paper. It is also supposed that the text was originally written continuously, without interpunction or division of words, sentences, and paragraphs. But there may have been cases in which some expedient was *occasionally* adopted for the purpose of marking a division, *ex gr.* a simple dot at the end of a word. And it is likely there was such. Accents, spirits, and iota subscribed were also wanting. The character was what is called the *uncial*, the cursive not having come into general use till the tenth century. In consequence of the original absence of these distinctions and marks in the text, MSS. differ in the mode of separating words from one another. Thus

Philip. i. 1, where the usual text has σὺν ἐπισκόποις, Codd. 39, 67, 71, have συνεπισκόποις. So do the ancient interpreters, as we learn from various passages in the works of Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Theodoret in particular. Hence συνεπισκόποις is the reading adopted by Chrysostom and other fathers. Hence also Epiphanius blames some persons for separating John i. 3 thus, χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδέν, and connecting ὃ γέγονεν with ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. He recommends that the passage should be read . . . . . ἐγένετο οὐδὲν ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ. But Irenaeus reads the passage in the way condemned by Epiphanius. Chrysostom again regards the division followed by Irenaeus and others as *heretical*, referring it to the Macedonians. Similar examples of different division in the text of the epistles might be given from the commentaries of Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret.

The inconveniences of the continuous mode of writing must have been felt at an early period. Accordingly remedies were applied to remove, or at least to lessen them. About the year 462 Euthalius, a deacon at Alexandria, divided the text of the Pauline epistles, and soon after that of the Acts and Catholic epistles into στίχοι or *lines* containing so many words as were to be read uninterruptedly. Of his procedure in the gospels we have no account. We know that they too were so separated; but are unable to discover whether Euthalius himself arranged them in that manner. The reckoning by στίχοι was called *stichometry*, and a copy furnished with such distinction a *stichometrical* one. This mode of writing was adopted in MSS. several of which have survived with it, as the codex Cantabrigiensis, Claromontanus, &c.

It should not be supposed however that it was regularly received into all MSS. It was adopted in some, perhaps the majority, in different places. But it was never a regular, universal system of division.

The following is an example from H. or the Codex Coislinianus :—

Titus ii. 3.

ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΑΣ ΝΗΦΑΛΙΟΥΣ ΕΙΝΑΙ
ΣΕΜΝΟΥΣ
ΣΩΦΡΟΝΑΣ
ΥΓΙΑΙΝΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΗ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ
ΤΗ ΑΓΑΠΗ
ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΙΔΑΣ ΩΣΑΥΤΩΣ
ΕΝ ΚΑΤΑΣΤΗΜΑΤΙ ΙΕΡΟΠΡΕΠΕΙΣ
ΜΗ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΥΣ
ΜΗ ΟΙΝΩ ΠΟΛΛΩ ΔΕΔΟΥΛΩΜΕΝΑΣ
ΚΑΛΟΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥΣ.

The entire number of *στίχοι* is usually given at the end of each book, but it does not necessarily follow that every MS. having an enumeration of *στίχοι* at the end was actually divided as to its text in that manner, when first written. They were sometimes very short as in E. or cod. Laud. where each line generally contains but one word.

The *ῥήματα* which are also enumerated at the end of MSS. or books, may be the same as the *στίχοι*. Hug states,* that as far as known, the *ῥήματα* are found only in the gospels, or in MSS. containing the gospels. If therefore a different person from Euthalius divided the gospels, he may readily have given the divisions a different name from that applied to the epistles and Acts.

In order to save the space necessarily lost in stichometry, points were afterwards put for the end of each *στίχος*, and the text was written continuously as at first. This is observable in cod. K. or Cyprius, according to Hug. Yet the points in this MS. may be its interpunction-marks without any reference to *στίχοι*, especially as they are similar to the

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 219, fourth edition.

interpunction of the cod. Boernerianus.* Or, a large letter was placed at the beginning of a στίχος, as in the cod. Boernerianus, where however there is also a corrupt and absurd interpunction.

It is often asserted that grammatical interpunction gradually arose from stichometry. But the assertion is not well-founded. There was an interpunction in New Testament MSS. *before* stichometry, as in the cod. Alexandrinus A. which doubtless was intended to facilitate the reading. From this time onward till the ninth century the marks and signs of punctuation were different in different MSS. They were irregular and fluctuating. Thus Isidore of Seville states that the only note of division in his time was a single point, which is thought to have been placed at the bottom to denote a short pause or comma; to denote a larger pause or semicolon, in the middle; and to denote a period or full pause, at the top of the last letter in the sentence. But it is very doubtful whether this definite meaning was intended by the different collocation. Cod. Basil. E. is thus pointed. In others, as in the cod. Ephrem. the point is placed near the middle of the letter. Cod. Laud. employs a cross for a period. Others use it for almost all the punctuation marks, as Vatican. 1067. If we may judge from the codex Augiensis which is assigned to the ninth century, words were also separated by blank spaces or intervals, and a point at the end of each. Cod. Vatican. of Matthaei, belonging to the eighth century, has the point and the comma; and cod. Vatican. 351 the colon. A *regular system* of punctuation was not established till after the invention of printing. In the tenth century, punctuation had attained a considerable degree of regularity; but the laws and external marks of it fluctuated and varied, till they were firmly settled in the early printed editions. Robert Stephens varied the punctuation in his successive editions.

Accents are more ancient than στίχοι or lines. They had

* Hupfeld, Studien und Kritiken for 1837, p. 859.

been applied at least to the Old Testament, before the time of Euthalius. It is *possible* they may have been partially adopted in the New Testament at that period. But Euthalius first brought them into general use in his stichometrical edition of the New Testament. Yet they were frequently omitted in stichometrical MSS. after his time. The accentuation system first became universal about the tenth century. At the same time also, *iota subscript* was introduced with the cursive writing, though it was often written afterwards *beside* the letters. The Greek note of interrogation came into use in the ninth century.

As early as the third century, mention is made of divisions called κεφάλαια. Probably they were of indefinite length, like the *Capitula* of Jerome in the Old Testament. Both Tertullian and Dionysius of Alexandria allude to them.

The gospels were anciently divided into *definite* κεφάλαια and τίτλοι. The former are usually attributed to Ammonius of Alexandria, who, in making a harmony of the gospels divided the text into a number of these little sections. To these Ammonian sections Eusebius adapted his ten tables or canons which represent a harmony of the gospels. Hence they are called Ammonian-Eusebian sections. They are numbered in the side margin of MSS., and in extent are smaller than our present chapters, since Acts contained 40, the epistle to the Romans 19, and that to the Galatians 12. The τίτλοι or *breves* were of later origin than the κεφάλαια, but their precise date as well as their author cannot be discovered. Cæsarius in the fourth century does not seem to have known them. Nor did Epiphanius and Chrysostom. But Euthymius and Theophylact were well acquainted with them. Hence it has been inferred, that they are not older than the sixth century. The τίτλοι are larger sections than the κεφάλαια, and are so called because the titles or subjects of those portions are written either in the upper or lower margin of Greek MSS.

It is to be regretted, that these τίτλοι or larger portions were also called κεφάλαια by several writers, thus leading to confusion and mistake. They were so denominated by Theophylact, by Robert Stephens, and Küster. Even in the very same MS. the smaller portions are rightly styled κεφάλαια in the note at the end of it; while the larger portions are also called κεφάλαια (instead of τίτλοι) in the account given at the beginning of the MS. Such is the case in the codex Regius 2861. The gospel of Matthew contains 68 τίτλοι and 355 κεφάλαια; that of Mark 48 τίτλοι and 352 κεφάλαια; that of Luke 83 τίτλοι and 348 κεφάλαια. John's gospel has 18 τίτλοι and 232 κεφάλαια. Both divisions are found in most MSS. of the gospels.

The Acts of the Apostles and Epistles were also divided into κεφάλαια or chapters, which many have ascribed to the invention of Euthalius in the fifth century. But it appears from his own language, that he merely composed *the summaries* of the chapters, τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθεσιν, in the Acts and Catholic epistles; while in regard to Paul's epistles, *the summaries* had been already made by one whom he praises as "one of our wisest and Christ-loving fathers," but does not name. These *summaries* he incorporated with his stichometrical edition; but the *division itself* into chapters he did not make. The number of such chapters is in Acts 40; in the epistle of James 6; in 1 Peter 8; in 2 Peter 4; in 1 John 7; in 2 John 1; 3 John 1; Jude 4; epistle to Romans 19; 1 Corinth. 9; 2 Corinth. 11; Gal. 12; Eph. 10; Philip. 7; Colos. 10; 1 Thes. 7; 2 Thes. 6; epistle to Heb. 22; 1 Timothy 18; 2 Timothy 9; Titus 6; Phil. 2. This division of chapters is commonly found in Greek MSS.

Andreas of Cappadocia, in the fifth century, divided the Apocalypse into 24 λόγοι and 72 κεφάλαια.

Besides these divisions many MSS. of the Greek Testament have others that deserve attention. The Jews were accustomed to divide the Pentateuch and the Prophets into

chapters, one of which was read every Sabbath day. It was probably in imitation of this practice that the New Testament, which was publicly read in the early Christian assemblies, was similarly distributed into *church-lessons*. Euthalius introduced into his stichometrical edition 57 such sections in the Acts and Epistles. The gospels were similarly divided. They are called ἀναγνώσματα or ἀναγνώσεις. They have also been termed περικοπαί, a word applied to the Jewish sections by Justin Martyr.* It occurs also in Clement of Alexandria. It is very doubtful however whether the use of it in Stromat. iv. 503, vii. 750, be identical with the ἀναγνώσματα or *church-lessons*. More probable is it, as De Wette conjectures,† that it is the same as κεφάλαιον in the oldest sense of that word, *capitulum*. The gospels had the same number of sections for public reading, viz. 57. It has been thought that this number both in the gospels and the other parts of the New Testament arose from its adaptation to the 53 Sundays in the longest year, and four festivals. In this manner the whole of the New Testament would be read in a year. But the assumption is very questionable. It does not appear that the Christians were habituated to this exact routine. They selected certain books at certain times, from the Old Testament as well as the New. In his stichometrical MSS., Euthalius marked these lessons by α (ἀρχή) at the beginning of each, and τ (τέλος) at the end. It is thus in the codex Bezae. Marsh states‡ that he saw other MSS. in which the Sunday is marked at the beginning of each lesson which is to be read on that day, by the word σάββατον with a number annexed to it, thus ϹΑ.Γ, ϹΑ.Δ.

As festival days multiplied, this division did not suit the altered arrangement. Certain passages therefore were selected from the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles for reading lessons, and

* Dial. cum Tryph. capp. 65, 72. † Einleitung, p. 43, Note a.
‡ Notes to Michaelis, vol. ii. pp. 907, 908.

the rest were omitted. Such selections were adapted to the Sundays and festivals of the year according to a certain order. The practice also began of writing them together in a separate MS. which was called ἐκλογάδιον, or *Lectionarium* in Latin. When it contained selections from the gospels alone, it was termed εὐαγγελιςάριον or Evangeliarium; from the Acts and Epistles πραξαπόςολος. In these codices the selections were often written in the order in which they were to be read.

Such reading-books were made earlier among the Latins than the Greeks. In the Latin church they can be traced to the middle of the fifth century; in the Greek to the eighth, in the time of John Damascenus.

The term συναξάριον, for which the Latins used *Capitulare* and *Lectionarium*, means a list of reading-lessons for the Sundays in the year, marked by the initial and closing words. *Menologium* again means a like list for festival and saints' days in the year. Sometimes both accompany MSS., sometimes only one of them. Scholz has transcribed the Synaxarium and Menologium belonging to K. and M. 262, 274, at the end of the first volume of his critical edition of the Greek Testament.

With regard to the titles of the separate books, it is generally admitted that they did not proceed from the writers themselves. They are of later origin. In some cases they are unsuitable, as πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων. They differ in MSS. Thus we find τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, &c. It is also apparent from various statements in the writings of the fathers, that they were not prefixed by the authors of the books. The evangelists indeed may have prefixed the single word εὐαγγέλιον, as Chrysostom says Matthew did;* but the phrases κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, were added afterwards. The titles were prefixed to the different gospels and epistles after the

* Homil. 1 in Matth. Praef.

latter were collected together, to distinguish the compositions of the respective writers, and were used early, most of them in the second century; as we infer from Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, and Tertullian.

The subscriptions were originally nothing but repetitions of the titles. At a subsequent period however, when commentators began to enquire into the circumstances connected with the individual books, notices of the place where they were written and other points were appended. The author of the *Synopsis of Sacred Scripture* gives most of the places in which Paul's epistles were written; and Euthalius introduced into his stichometrical edition of the New Testament the summaries prefixed to the various books in this Synopsis; as also the places assigned to Paul's epistles. But he varies from these places in several instances, in his *subscriptions*. Having obtained a definite form from Euthalius, they retained it afterwards in most MSS. Their inaccuracies are well known.

The present division of the New Testament into chapters was made by Cardinal Hugo in the thirteenth century, from whom proceeded also that in the Old Testament. It was introduced by him into his *Biblia cum postilla* whence it came into the Greek Testament also. The division into verses was first made by Sanctes Pagninus in his translation of the Bible into Latin from the Hebrew and the Greek, published at Lyons in 4to in 1528. The invention however is usually attributed to Robert Stephens, who made it, as his son Henry tells us, on a journey from Paris to Lyons (*inter equitandum*). It was introduced into his edition of 1551, which was his fourth of the Greek Testament. It should be observed that Stephens does not follow Pagninus's division in the New Testament, though he does in the Old. His verses differ from Pagninus's. His own statement is that it was founded on the stichometrical practice of ancient Greek MSS. It was doubt-

less so founded in part. Whether Pagninus himself adopted his division from MSS. is not known. But Stephens does not refer to the system of Pagninus, though there is sufficient evidence that he was acquainted with it. One thing is manifest, that his division is worse than that of Pagninus, or even the ancient stichometrical one. Michaelis thinks that the meaning of the phrase "inter equitandum" is not that Robert Stephens accomplished the task while riding on horseback, but that he amused himself with it during the intervals of his journey at the inn. "If his division," says Dr. Wright, "was a mere modification of that of Pagninus, it might easily have been done 'inter equitandum.'"*

* In Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

CHAPTER III.

CAUSES OF VARIOUS READINGS.

BEFORE proceeding to give the history of the text itself, we shall point out the causes of various readings in it. These should be known before the states through which it has passed and the attempts made to restore its original form be described. What circumstances contributed to departures in the text from its primitive condition? What gave rise to changes in it? Endeavours to bring it back to its pristine purity presuppose deteriorating causes.

Alterations of the original text, or as they are termed various *readings*, may be traced to two sources, *accident* and *design*. Mistakes were made *unintentionally* or *purposely*.

(*a*) Accidental mistakes.

1. Transcribers *saw* badly, and therefore they mistook letters for one another, especially those whose shape was somewhat alike. They also *transposed* letters, words, and sentences. They also *omitted* letters, words, and clauses, especially when two of them terminated in the same way. In like manner, they *repeated* letters from mistake in sight. Examples may be found in Mark v. 14, ἀνήγγειλαν for ἀπήγγειλαν; Romans xii. 13, μνείαις for χρείαις; Luke ix. 49, ἐκωλύομεν for ἐκωλύσαμεν; Acts x. 38, ὅς for ὡς, and also ὡς for ὅς. Transposition of *single letters* is exemplified in Mark xiv. 65, where ἔλαβον is for ἔβαλον; xv. 16, where ἔω is for ἔσω; of *words* in Romans

i. 13, καρπὸν τινὰ for τινὰ καρπὸν; ix. 11, τοῦ θεοῦ πρόθεσις for πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ. The omission of words and sentences by ὁμοιοτέλευτον was not uncommon. When a word occurred a second time after a short interval, the copyist having written it once, looked again at the MS. before him, and his eye happened to catch the same word *in its second occurrence*. Hence he omitted the part between the word at its first and second occurrence. This happened too when the final *syllable* was alike. Thus in Matt. v. 19, the words between βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, a phrase which appears twice, are left out in several copies. So also in Matt. x. 23, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην instead of φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην, κἂν ἐκ ταύτης ἐκδιώξουσι ὑμᾶς, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην. Here editors differ as to which was the original reading. In regard to the *final syllable*, omission on account of it is exemplified in Luke vii. 21, ἐχαρίσατο τὸ βλέπειν instead of ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν; Luke ix. 49, ἐκβάλλοντα τὰ δαιμόνια for ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια.

Repetition is exemplified in ἐγενήθημεν νήπιοι, in place of ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι, 1 Thes. ii. 7; Καπερναοὺμ μή for Καπερναοὺμ ἡ, Matt. xi. 23, where by mistake the final letter is written twice.

2. Transcribers *heard* wrongly or imperfectly, and fell into mistakes. They often wrote from the dictation of others to facilitate their task. Hence they were misled by different words similarly pronounced, or by different letters similarly sounded. Here what is termed *Itacism* contributed especially to the production of errors. Vowels and dipthongs of like sound were exchanged for one another. Thus αι is put for ε, ε for αι, ει for η, ει for ι, ει for υ, η for ει, η for ι, η for οι, η for υ, ι for η, ο for ω, οι for ει, υ for η, υ for οι, ω for ο. Thus in 1 Peter ii. 3, we find χρισὸς for χρηστός; Romans ii. 17, ἴδε instead of εἰ δέ; in Acts xvii. 31, εἰκουμένην for οἰκουμένην; Acts v. 19, ἤνυξε for ἤνοιξε; 1 Corinth. x. 13, ἤλειφεν instead of εἴληφεν; Matt. xxvii. 60, κενῷ for καινῷ.

3. Transcribers made mistakes through failure of memory,

or by undue reliance upon it. Hence they transposed words, and interchanged synonymous ones. Reading over several words together, they might have inverted their order, or substituted a term of similar signification for one in the copy before them, before they began to write down what had been in their memory. Thus in Matt. xx. 10, *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνὰ δηνάριον* for *ἀνὰ δηνάριον καὶ αὐτοί*; 1 Corinth. xii. 20, *νυνί* for *νῦν*; Matt. ix. 8, *ἐφοβήθησαν* for *ἐθαύμασαν*; Rev. xvii. 17, *τὰ ῥήματα* for *οἱ λόγοι*; 1 Peter iii. 13, *μιμηταὶ* for *ζηλωταί*.

4. Transcribers made mistakes in judgment. They misapprehended the text before them, and therefore divided words badly, misunderstood abbreviations, and blundered with regard to marginal notes.

Examples of each of these may be furnished in abundance. As the most ancient MSS. were written in continuous lines without intervening spaces between words, it was natural for copyists sometimes to divide the words erroneously. Thus 2 Corinth xii. 19, *τὰ δὲ* for *τάδε*; Philip. i. 1, *συνεπισκόποις* for *σὺν ἐπισκόποις*; 1 Corinth. xv. 10, *οὐκ ἐνὶ* for *οὐ κενή*. Abbreviations being employed in MSS., they were also misunderstood. Thus 1 Tim. iii. 16, $\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$ for ΟΣ, or *vice versa*. Glosses in the margin and parallels were also taken into the text itself. Ignorant transcribers perceiving marginal glosses containing perhaps explanations of words by their synonyms, imagined that they belonged to the original text, and took them into it; or, though they did not think so, they thought the text might be improved by them, and therefore introduced them. An instance of this will be found in Acts i. 12, where cod. 40 reads after *σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν* the words *τοσοῦτον ὄν τὸ διάστημα, ὅσον δυνατὸν Ἰουδαῖον περιπατῆσαι ἐν σαββάτῳ*. So also in Romans viii. 28, where A. B. place *ὁ θεὸς* after *συνεργεῖ*. Lachmann takes the word into the text as genuine. In 2 Corinth viii. 4, after *ἁγίους* several MSS. insert *δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς*.

In the gospels the same occurrence is often recorded more

fully by one of the evangelists than by another. Sometimes transcribers thought that the shorter account is imperfect, and ought to be supplied from the longer. Thus the words in Matt. xxvii. 35, after *βάλλοντες κλῆρον*, viz. *ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου· διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον* have been inserted from John xix. 24. This sort of supplement has been put to passages taken from the Old Testament, as Mark vi. 11, Matt. viii. 13, Luke xvii. 36. Supplements from parallel places of the evangelists appear in Matt. xx. 28, from Luke xiv. 8; Matt. xxvii. 28, from Mark xv. 17 and John xix. 2; Mark v. 19, from ii. 4. Sometimes they have been taken from the commentaries of the fathers and ancient scholia, or from apocryphal writings, ex. gr. Matt. xx. 28, vi. 33, xxvii. 49; Mark xvi. 8, 14; Luke vi. 5, xix. 17, xxiv. 43; sometimes from evangelistaria and lectionaries, ex. gr. Matt. vi. 13, xiii. 23; Luke xii. 15, 21, xii. 4, xiv. 24, xi. 2, 4. Of such historical additions, the Cambridge MS. (D) alone is said to furnish six hundred examples.

These are the principal kinds of alterations that have been made in the text of the Greek Testament that may be classed under the head *accidental*, because they were not made with the intention of corrupting the sacred records or of falsifying the text. They may be called involuntary errors. They originated in part in the haste or carelessness of transcribers who either lacked sufficient accuracy of manner in copying MSS., or sufficient knowledge.

(*b.*) *Intentional* errors.

These may be divided into two classes, viz., changes made in the text for the purpose of altering the sense, or changes introduced through uncritical officiousness. In the one case the purpose was bad, for alterations were made by those who knew them to be *corruptions;* but in the other the design was generally good, for the alterations were thought to make the text more perspicuous and better.

Very few wilful corruptions were made in the text by the catholic christians in early times. They had great respect for the sacred records. Some, however, of the early heretics falsified it in places. The charge lies chiefly against them, though we cannot say that the orthodox were never guilty of it, for the clause οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός in Mark xiii. 32 is omitted in some MSS.; and we learn from Origen or his Latin interpreter, that in Matt. xxvii. 17, some ancient copies had Ἰησοῦν βαραββᾶν, *Jesus Barabbas*. *Jesus* appears to have been left out, that the name might not be given to any wicked person, as Origen says; and Tischendorf has properly restored it. On the whole, the text of the Greek Testament has suffered very little from *wilful* corruption.

In relation to the latter class of changes introduced into the text, they originated in a desire to rectify, smooth, improve, or illustrate the text. Transcribers and others sometimes thought that they could add to the correctness or elegance of the copies before them. But they often attempted what they were neither justified in undertaking nor qualified to perform. We can easily suppose that a Greek accustomed to the style and diction of the native Grecian writers might look upon the Hebraised language of the New Testament as harsh in many idioms. The Grammarians of Alexandria would naturally so think. Though the diction is precisely such as might be expected beforehand from writers born in Judea, yet it would appear strange to many others. Hence some undertook to correct what needed no correction, with the view of softening harsh idioms and removing apparent inelegancies of expression. A difficult and obscure reading was changed into a clearer and more easy one. The following are examples:—

The terminations belonging to the Alexandrine dialect were removed in the forms εἶπαν, ἦλθαν, ἔπεσαν, &c. In Rev. ii. 20 the apparently ungrammatical τὴν γυναῖκα . . . . .

ἡ λέγουσα was changed into the regular grammatical construction τὴν γυναῖκα . . . . τὴν λέγουσαν. So too in Rev. iv. 1, λέγων was altered into λέγουσα. In John i. 14, D. has πλήρη instead of πλήρης. In Luke viii. 31, we find παρεκάλει instead of παρεκάλουν; Luke xxiv. 39, ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός for ἐγώ εἰμι; Acts xx. 16, εἴη for ἦν; Matt. xv. 32, ἡμέρας τρεῖς for ἡμέραι τρεῖς; Luke i. 64, ἀνεῴχθή τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ in two MSS. for ἀνεῴχθη τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ. A tautology was removed in Mark xii. 23, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει instead of ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν. In like manner, a pleonasm was taken from the text in some copies by omitting τι, 2 Corinth. xii. 6. In Acts xxvi. 3 ἐπιστάμενος was inserted after μάλιστα to make the construction easier. So too 1 Peter ii. 20, the unusual word κολαφιζόμενοι was altered into κολαζόμενοι in various MSS.

Historical, geographical, archaeological and doctrinal difficulties which caused perplexity were removed from the text, and other expressions introduced. So in Mark ii. 26 some MSS. omit the words ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, others omit only τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, others read Ἀβιμελεκ for Ἀβιάθαρ. In Matt. xxvii. 9 Ἱερεμίου is left out, or changed into Ζαχαρίου. In John xix. 14 ὥρα τρίτη is put for ὥρα ἕκτη. In John i. 28 βηθαβαρᾷ for βηθανίᾳ; Matt. viii. 28, Γεργεσηνῶν for Γαδαρηνῶν was often put. In John vii. 39, to οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον some copies add ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, or δεδομένον or δοθέν. In Matt. v. 22 εἰκῇ is omitted by many authorities, perhaps rightly. The usual reading in Acts xx. 28 is θεοῦ instead of κυρίου. In 1 John v. 7 the three heavenly witnesses were added to the genuine text.

The liturgical use of the New Testament gave rise to additions and omissions. Thus ὁ Ἰησοῦς was frequently interpolated, as in Matt. iv. 12. The doxology of the Lord's prayer, Matt. vi. 13, was taken from a similar source. So too

in xiii. 23, the phrase ὁ ἔχων ὦτα, κ. τ. λ. was added. Ἀμήν at the end of books was often appended. In Acts iii. 11 τοῦ ἀθέντος χωλοῦ, and xx. 16, ἔκρινε were taken from lectionaries and wrongly put into the text.

In addition to all that has been said on this subject, it should be remarked, that the MS. itself from which a transcriber copied may have been occasionally effaced in letters and words, or illegible. Here the fault of failing to reproduce an accurate text was not attributable to the copyist, but to the MS. he had before him.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT ITSELF.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

HAVING noticed the causes of alteration in the original text, we proceed to describe it in the various phases through which it has passed.

Although no definite time can be assigned to the close of the canon, and therefore no division in the history of the New Testament text can be made by means of an event so important, yet the collecting of the books into a volume must necessarily be touched at various points of the description. The gathering together of the separate epistles and gospels had an influence on the purity and preservation of the original text. We have therefore deemed it advisable to say a few words on the canon *before* the history of the text itself. In this way, it will be better apprehended than if it had been incorporated with the general discussion of the whole subject. The mode in which the canon was formed, and the time at which it was closed, will be more clearly understood than if it had been mixed up with the history of the text itself.

In examining the state of the text before the close of the canon, we are deficient in the knowledge of well accredited facts. History fails in assisting to bring to light the changes which the books of the New Testament underwent in regard

to their text, *at the earliest period.* How they were preserved during the first two centuries—with what care they were copied—how often they were transcribed—with what degree of veneration they were looked upon by different churches and christians—how much authority was attributed to them—by what test they were kept apart from similar writings afterwards termed *apocryphal;* these are interesting questions to which *precise* and *definite* answers cannot be given.

Let us first inquire how and when the canon was *closed.*

We think it right to omit all allusion to a passage in 2 Peter iii. 16, where the writer speaks of the epistles of Paul, in a way, as some suppose, which indicates that *all* or the greater part of them had been collected together at that time. This passage can be regarded as containing the first certain notice of the existence of a collection of several New Testament writings *only* by assuming the epistle in question to have been really written by the apostle Peter. There are circumstances however connected with the fact indicated in the words that tend to throw suspicion on the authenticity of the epistle. At all events, we must not assume the apostolic origin of the epistle at this preliminary stage of the inquiry, and deduce from it the existence of an early collection in the time of Peter.

Neither can anything be properly inferred from the character of the fourth gospel as to John having the other gospels before him. That he had them before him when he wrote it, or that he himself made any collection of the New Testament books, is very improbable.

It is likely that the first attempt at a collection began with the epistles, in the northern parts of Asia Minor. Marcion's list is the first we hear of in history. It is now impossible to tell whether any collection had preceded his time. We learn however that he had a collection consisting of ten Pauline epistles called ὁ ἀπόστολος; to which he added the

εὐαγγέλιον, apparently a mutilated gospel of Luke. Bertholdt thinks that the ὁ ἀπόστολος had previously existed in Pontus, and that Marcion merely adopted it and made it known more extensively, placing with it his εὐαγγέλιον. This was about the middle of the second century. Repairing from Asia Minor to Rome, Marcion spread a knowledge of the collection in Italy. Thus the ἀπόστολος was probably made in Asia Minor, being the earliest attempt to bring together a number of the sacred records of Christianity into one volume. We must recollect however that *the appellation* was not used so early. The name ὁ ἀπόστολος was of later origin. It comprehended, as has been stated, ten Pauline epistles, viz. one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, and one to Philemon.

From Pontus and Galatia this original collection must have spread into other parts, such as the western districts of Asia Minor. There, as well as elsewhere, it was immediately enlarged with additional books or epistles. About Ephesus and Smyrna, the epistles to Timothy and Titus, John's gospel and his first epistle, the Acts of the Apostles, with the gospels of Matthew and Mark which must have circulated in those parts, were probably put into the collection. Hence the εὐαγγέλιον received three other gospels—the ἀπόστολος, five other epistles or books. In like manner, the first epistle of Peter was attached; since Irenaeus had brought to Lyons from western Asia, about A.D. 170, the εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολος, the latter of which contained the epistle in question.

In Syria the collection received two new books, viz. the epistle of James and that to the Hebrews, as is shewn by the old Syriac version or Peshito.

In Egypt, the ἀπόστολος of Clemens Alexandrinus embraced the same books as that of Irenaeus, viz. thirteen epistles of Paul, the Acts, the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter.

In northern Africa, the εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολος were of the same extent as in the localities represented by Irenaeus and Clement; a fact we learn from Tertullian.

In Rome, the ἀπόστολος of Marcion was enlarged merely with the addition of the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and the Acts of the Apostles. Others *may have been* admitted, for several parts of the catalogue or fragment on the canon published by Maratori are very obscure, and conjectures as to the probable meaning of them have discovered in it the first epistle of Peter and the epistle to the Hebrews. But the case is more than doubtful regarding the epistle to the Hebrews. And though two epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse, are *mentioned* in that Roman catalogue, they are placed on a level with certain apocryphal writings, such as the Wisdom of Solomon. Thus though others are spoken of, and though they were even read in public in the churches, they were separated from the regular list which we know to have been made up of thirteen epistles of Paul with the Acts of the Apostles. The same rank and authority were not assigned to them. Yet soon after the catalogue was made, the first epistles of Peter and John were put into the ἀπόστολος in the churches of Italy, since Origen affirms forty years after, that the whole catholic church received the four gospels, the Acts, thirteen epistles of Paul, with the first epistles of Peter and John.

Such was the progress that had been made towards a complete collection of the New Testament books, or in other words, the formation of the Christian canon, about the middle of the third century, except in the old Syrian church, which had the epistle to the Hebrews and that of James besides.

Before this time, or about the beginning of the third century, the two collections, viz. εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολος had been put together under one name, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, *Novum Testamentum*. Thus Tertullian, in his treatise against Marcion, applies *Novum Testamentum* to the whole collection.

Yet both he and Clemens Alexandrinus speak of the two as separate parts of a whole. Even Origen does so at a later period. Towards the middle of the third century, the two appellations disappear from the face of history, giving place to *the one* general title.

As far then as the very meagre evidence we possess will enable us to arrive at a conclusion on the subject, all the books of the New Testament we have specified were known, circulated, and highly regarded in different countries during the first half of the third century as one collection, and with a general title. The parts now belonging to the New Testament which were not usually included in the collection at that time were, the epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, the second epistle of Peter, that of Jude, with the second and third epistles of John. These had been known and quoted, probably looked upon as authentic and canonical by some in all countries where they were circulated; but they had not attained the position of the rest. They were not *commonly* regarded as of like authority.

With the exception of the six writings just mentioned, the remainder were appealed to as *sacred*, *inspired*, as *the rule and standard* of Christian truth. Hence we may say that the canon was *virtually* formed in the early part of the third century. We use the word *virtually*, because at that time it was not *fully* and *finally* settled as to all its parts. Hesitation and doubt still existed about some portions now included in the New Testament. Six books or epistles were not established in the public estimation as inspired. The inferior position assigned to them arose doubtless from different causes. It was owing to the remoteness of readers from the locality where a particular book first appeared—to the nature of the book itself, its character, peculiarities, and scope—to the subjective views of leading fathers in determining the claims of a work to be of *divine* origin. There is little doubt that some fathers enter-

tained suspicion of some books, which others did not share. Hence the canon was not *closed* at the period we speak of. The great body of it was fixed; but a few epistles had not been permanently attached.

The epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse were fully received into the collection very soon after the middle of the third century. This was done, as might be readily supposed, earlier in some places than in others. Indeed some members of the Greek and oriental church had admitted the former as canonical even prior to that time—a treatment of it which speedily became general. The prevailing practice was to place the epistle to the Hebrews among the Pauline epistles not long after the middle of the third century, throughout the Greek church. The Apocalypse was not so favourably received in the same quarter. Yet it *was* deemed canonical by those who decided on *historical* rather than *doctrinal* grounds. Unfortunately however they were the fewer in number.

When Eusebius wrote his ecclesiastical history, the Apocalypse had not been admitted into the canon by many belonging to the oriental and Greek church. But he quietly puts the epistle to the Hebrews among the Pauline; indicating the prevailing sentiments respecting it. Thus in the first half of the fourth century, the epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse were acknowledged as of equal authority with the other books of the New Testament by the Christians of the oriental and Greek church; although several still rejected the latter.

In the Western and Latin church the case stood differently. There the Apocalypse was generally admitted as canonical. This follows from the mode in which Jerome names it. In the beginning of the fourth century it was received as apostolic in the west. But it was otherwise there with the epistle to the Hebrews, which was not commonly ranked among the canonical books before the time of Jerome.

From these remarks on the reception of the Apocalypse and the epistle to the Hebrews among the early Christians, it appears that the collection already established in the third century had been enlarged by the addition of both, in the first half of the fourth century—of the Apocalypse in the west generally, in the oriental and Greek church partially—of the epistle to the Hebrews in the oriental and Greek church universally, but very sparingly in the Latin church.

About the middle of the fourth century the epistles of James, Jude, second of Peter, second and third of John, which Eusebius, at the beginning of it, placed among the οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκα (not included among the canonical) generally appear in the list. They must have obtained a sure place there by the operation of powerful but silently working clauses. Slowly was their credit finally established by *influences* prior to the council of Nice A.D. 325. All the present books are enumerated as canonical in the Acts of the council of Laodicea about 360 A.D. This was the state of opinion in the Greek church. In the Latin church also, all the writings had fixed themselves in the general opinion as canonical, during the fourth century, as is shewn by the Acts of the council of Hippo A.D. 393. Hence about the middle of the fourth century or soon after, the entire collection was definitely fixed as *the canon*, κανών. The canon was *closed* about that time. It is true that we hear of doubts and suspicions afterwards in regard to some portions. Some were still rejected by writers here and there in the Catholic church. Speculative and critical men gave expression to unfavourable opinions of certain parts of the New Testament in succeeding centuries. But the scepticism of *individuals* does not affect the close of the canon as a *historical fact.*

The preceding observations shew that the formation of the New Testament canon was *gradual.* The collection was not made by one man, one council, at one time, or in one place. The adherents of the Christian religion in different lands came

to agree in the same conclusion *progressively*, and by *tacit consent*. They did so *independently* to a great extent, in countries remote from one another. They judged by internal evidence, by tradition, by the fact of the writers being apostles or apostolic men. Some relied on one criterion, some on another; the majority perhaps on ecclesiastical tradition; the most reflecting and critical on internal evidence. Slowly and surely did they arrive at the entire separation of the sacred Scriptures from the spurious imitations which were then current. And in the result of their judgment modern scholars commonly acquiesce.

Having thus considered as nearly as possible, the time *about* which the canon was closed, it will be seen that it is not sufficiently definite or fixed to serve as a resting-point in the history of the text. We cannot look upon it as a convenient landmark for our present purpose. Hence we will not inquire what may be discovered as to the state of the text before the books were finally collected. We will not take the period marked by the close of the canon and ask, is it possible to gather from early writers what was the condition of the text, whether it had been accurately preserved, how far it had been kept pure.

There is difficulty in distinguishing periods in the history of the text, without presupposing a theory of *recensions* or a *classification*, which it is better to avoid at present. And yet the history of the text, as hitherto treated, has consisted of little more than the speculative views of ingenious men. We might, for example, distinguish the period of the text's disordered condition, and that of its revised state; but we should convey thereby an erroneous impression, and sanction some such system as that of Hug or Griesbach. There was a time when greater attention was given to the text; when more persons applied correcting hands to it; when professed critics and grammarians appeared who handled it more or less freely. But such time was not coincident in different countries; and

in some it never existed. Nor had it a *palpable* beginning in any region. Persons here and there in different lands, and at various times, made what they considered corrections in a few passages of the copies which they had; but at no period was there a *general* recension. A few persons *may have revised several* copies; as will be considered hereafter; but the influence of their limited labours was insignificant amid the multitude of current MSS. and versions taken from the original.

Seeing then that we have no good resting place in the history of the text, we may terminate the first division of it with Origen. It will be most convenient to take, first, the period till the middle of the third century, not because any very marked or decided change in the text then took place, but because some critics of note have supposed it an important era. Till then they have imagined a chaotic state of the text, uncorrected, unrevised, confused, corrupt; and afterwards a new phase and form of it in various lands under several distinguished men. There was first, as they conjecture, the absence of all revision; then the presence and effects of recensions in different countries, which influenced the general aspect of the text everywhere.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT TILL THE MIDDLE OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

The autographs of the New Testament books were soon lost. The material to which the sacred writers consigned their invaluable compositions was frail and perishable. If indeed by *autograph* be understood epistles or gospels written by the hands of apostles or apostolic men, such had no existence, at least in part. We know that Paul generally employed an amanuensis. He merely dictated a number of his letters. A few he wrote with his own hand, as the epistle to the Galatians: "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand." To those which were simply dictated he himself appended the salutation—"The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle; so I write." But epistles thus dictated and accredited as authentic had the same value as proper autographs. They were in truth identical with them. Hence there is no use in distinguishing between *idiographs* and *autographs*.

It is somewhat remarkable that no trace of these autographs or primitive exemplars can be found in early history. Writers living very near the time of apostles do not speak of or appeal to them. In the course of the second century, if not at the end of the first, most of them had probably disappeared. How or where they were kept, how long each lasted, whether they

were worn by degrees and repeated handling, or lost by accident, are questions to which no answer can be given.

Yet some have fancied that early traces of their existence are discernible. Thus in his epistle to the Philadelphians (chapter viii.) Ignatius refers to τὰ ἀρχαία *i.e.* βίβλια, which expression has sometimes been explained, *autographs*. The whole passage runs thus :—"Because I have heard some say, unless I find it in the ancient writings, I will not believe it in the gospel; and when I said to them it is written [in the gospel], they answered me, it is found written before [in the ancient writings]." Here both the proper reading and the sense are uncertain. It is doubtful whether ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις or ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις should be considered the authentic expression of Ignatius. But it is generally agreed that both refer directly or indirectly to *the Old Testament*, and not to the autographs of the New. Indeed the context plainly shews that the two Testaments are contrasted, and that the persons whom the writer censures were unwilling to admit the New except so far as it was corroborated by the Old.*

There is also a passage in Tertullian's works which has been referred to the autographs of the apostolical epistles. He speaks of *authentic* letters, *authenticae literae*, an expression which has been supposed to mean the epistles themselves written by apostles or at least by an amanuensis from their dictation, and sent to the churches.† But it is quite arbitrary to take it in this sense. Tertullian lived in a country where the sacred writings were circulated and read in one or more Latin trans-

* See Griesbach, Historia textus Graeci epistolar. Paulin. sect. ii. p. 66 in his Opuscula Academica edited by Gabler, vol. ii. p. 66, et seq.; and Gabler's Praefatio, p. 26, et seq.

† "Age jam qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuae, percurre ecclesias apostolicas apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae Apostolorum suis locis praesident, apud quas ipsae authenticae literae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et praesentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxime est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia,

lations. In contrast with such copies, he speaks of *authentic* epistles, *i. e.* copies of the epistles preserved uncorrupted and genuine. A greater reputation belonged to the churches founded by apostles themselves, or to those which had received epistles from apostles. Greater credit was given to the copies they possessed because they were better preserved. Hence Tertullian refers such as wished to obtain a knowledge of the doctrines of salvation out of authentic sources, to the holy archives of the churches at Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Rome, &c. because in these churches the apostolic letters were to be met with *in their best accredited state*, and not because the autographs were there. Of course these copies were thought to be *pure* and *uncorrupted.* In that sense they were *authentic* as opposed to *adulterated* (adulteratum). Bertholdt and others explain the epithet to mean *Greek* copies, but though the word will bear this sense in itself, yet many reasons might be given against it in the passage before us. It has been clearly and copiously shewn by Griesbach* that *authenticae literae* in this place cannot mean Greek copies or *autographs*, but *genuine;* and he is followed by Gabler and Hug. It is certain that this father did not intend the *autographs*, else he would have appealed to them in his writings against Marcion, and so saved himself the trouble of conducting a lengthened argumentation. A single reference to *the originals themselves* would have *proved* Marcion's falsifications. But Tertullian did not terminate the controversy in this manner; and therefore it is fairly presumed that the autographs were not known to be in existence. The same remark may be applied to Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other

habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est."—De Praescriptt. Haerett. c. 36.

* See Griesbach's Opuscula Academica edited by Gabler, vol. ii. p. 69, and Praefatio, p. 31.

fathers. In their disputations with heretics they never dream of appealing to what must have been an infallible tribunal. They reason and adduce proofs, as if they knew nothing of *autographs*.

The writings of *the apostolic* fathers furnish little help in judging of the state of the text in their day, because they are chiefly occupied with the practical aspect of religion, and have a hortatory character. Hence, though phrases and expressions occur in them which coincide with the language of the New Testament, they are mere reminiscences of the latter. Very rarely do these fathers quote literally; for literal citation was unnecessary for their purpose, and incongruous with their habits of mind.

Let us glance at all in them that has a bearing on our present subject. Hermas occasionally *touches* the expressions of the Old and New Testaments, but does not *quote* any. There is not a single passage which contains a *literal citation*.

Clement of Rome carefully extracts passages from both Testaments, yet he very seldom has quotations that can be compared with the New. He does not cite a single place *accurately* or *literally*. He was better acquainted with the Jewish than the Christian records.

In the epistle of Barnabas there is but one citation from the text of the New Testament, and that is made in a form coinciding with the reading of the Vatican MS. (B.) viz. *παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου*, omitting the article before the participle (Luke vi. 30).

Ignatius affords very small assistance to the critic, because he does not so much *quote* as *allude to* the words of the Christian records. He never makes a *verbal* citation. He repeats from memory. This is seen in the following places, where the most prominent and nearest allusions to the Greek text occur:—

'Ο *χωρῶν χωρείτω*. See Matt. xix. 12.

Βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, Matt. iii. 15.

Περίψημα τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ σταυροῦ, ὁ ἐστιν σκάνδαλον τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος· ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ συζητής; ποῦ καύχησις τῶν λεγομένων συνετῶν, 1 Corinth. i. 18, &c.

Φανερὸν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ, Matt. xii. 33.

Πρέπον ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ ἦτε κατηρτισμένοι τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, 1 Corinth. i. 10.

Φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐν ἅπασιν, καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡσεὶ περιστερά, Matt. x. 16.*

Polycarp commonly quotes loosely, of which perhaps his omission of οὐ before κληρονομήσουσιν in 1 Corinth. vi. 10 is an example, though he may have omitted it because it was wanting in his copy, since very ancient authorities do not read it. He has however some citations which we may compare with the present text. In a few cases we learn what was in his copy. Thus he cites Acts ii. 24, ὃν ἔγειρεν ὁ θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου. Here we cannot suppose that he really had in his copy ἔγειρεν instead of ἀνέστησεν. He confounded the one with the other. But there is no doubt that he had τοῦ ᾅδου for τοῦ θανάτου, since many ancient authorities have the same, such as D., the Vulgate, Syriac, &c.

In 1 Timothy vi. 7 for δῆλον ὅτι the received reading, this father has ἀλλ', which Augustine and other authorities also read.

In 1 John iv. 3 he reads, πᾶς ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστος ἐστιν. Here is ἐληλυθέναι for ἐληλυθότα, just as in the former verse the same infinitive occurs for the same participle in Theodoret.†

In a few extant fragments of Papias are quoted 1 Corinth. xv. 25, 26; and after an interval of some verses, one part of the 27th verse and the 28th. The citation agrees very nearly

* Prolegomena to Tischendorf's first Leipzig edition, p. 25.

† Ibid, p. 25.

with the received text, the only difference being that Papias has τότε αὐτός, as in many ancient authorities, for τότε καὶ αὐτός; and ὁ υἱός is omitted, as it is by many of the fathers.*

With regard to Justin Martyr, it is difficult to form a definite conclusion as to the state of the Greek text before him. We believe that he had our present gospels, and alludes to them under the title of ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων. The weight of evidence is decidedly favourable to that conclusion, notwithstanding all that has been recently written against it by the Tübingen school. But Justin has cited very much from memory. He has not been careful about the words. In passages descriptive of the *life and actions* of Christ he differs widely from our present canonical gospels, either relating what they do not contain, or speaking of facts in a different manner. Where he refers to the *sayings and precepts* of Christ he comes nearer the text, but does not commonly agree with it. In Matthew and Luke only it has been ascertained that he coincides with various witnesses in opposition to the received text, and often so as to present improbable readings. He has three varieties of reading, consisting in the omission of certain Greek words, the interchange of terms, and their transposition. Hence he seldom agrees with the characteristic readings of what has been called the Alexandrine family or recension, or even with the Constantinopolitan. For this fact it is easy to account, as will be seen from the following pages.

From the apostolical fathers to which we have referred, no certain conclusion can be drawn respecting the state of the text during the period which immediately succeeded that of the apostles. Little can be learned from them, except that in those days the Christians were not anxious about the purity of the text. They had not much reverence for the letter. They venerated *the spirit* more than *the words*. The latter were not so holy in their eyes as *the meaning* conveyed in them. Hence

* Prolegomena to Tischendorf's first Leipzig edition, p. 26.

alterations took place which would not have been made in other circumstances. Had they been studious about preserving the *ipsissima verba* they would hardly have allowed the autographs to disappear so soon. Their copies therefore had several diversities, and they did not think of revising them. They contributed indeed to those diversities by quoting loosely, by not adhering to the very terms of the New Testament and their proper position, by trusting to memory, by negligence. But when we proceed to examine a class of writers later than the apostolical fathers who were led to treat extensively of scriptural subjects and doctrines—when we come down to authors who wrote after 130 we begin to observe more important and extensive diversities in the text than those which had appeared before. This is observable in Justin Martyr, who might perhaps have been more appropriately reserved till the present section, though his habits of handling scripture are such as render his works of comparatively little utility. Before the year 127 the history of *proper* diversities in the text can hardly be considered as commencing. That there were mistakes and errors in it then must be allowed; but the greater part of them had arisen from the carelessness of transcribers. Ignorance, negligence, haste, and other like sources of corruption gave rise to most of them. They owed their origin to mere carelessness. But about the time mentioned other causes began to produce mistakes in considerable numbers. Not that they had been wholly inoperative till then, but that their fruits were neither many nor prominent before. And what, it may be asked, were these sources of corruption? Did writers who had MSS. in their hands, and copyists, deteriorate the text *knowingly?* They did so with more or less knowledge of what they were doing, yet not with the intention of spoiling and corrupting the text. They had not generally an evil purpose. Capriciousness and fancy led them to take liberties. Their design was commonly good, though they handled their copies

with freedom. They had little idea of blame attaching to them in consequence. Most supposed that they made the text no worse; that they did not treat it improperly; that they rather made it better.

These observations are justified by the complaints which several writers make with regard to corruptions in the text. And such complaints reach up to an early period, for they occur in Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria. It would appear that even in their time false readings had got into the text of current MSS. Nor can the testimony of these and other fathers be reasonably questioned, especially as it is confirmed by quotations from scripture in their own and other ancient writings. Dionysius writes,—"As the brethren desired me to write epistles, I wrote them, and these the apostles of the devil have filled with tares, exchanging some things and adding others, for whom there is a woe reserved. It is not therefore matter of wonder if they have also attempted to adulterate the sacred writings."* Clement of Alexandria speaks of persons who turned the gospels into metaphrases (*τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια*) quoting a text (Matt. v. 9, 10) to shew in what manner they proceeded.† Irenaeus speaks of persons who affected to be more knowing than the apostles (*peritiores apostolis*), quoting a passage and showing how they read and explained it.‡ Tertullian

* Ἐπιστολὰς γὰρ . . . . ἔγραψα· καὶ ταύτας οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπόζολοι ζιζανίων γεγέμικαν, ἃ μὲν ἐξαιροῦντες, ἃ δὲ προστιθέντες. Οἷς τὸ οὐαὶ κεῖται. Οὐ θαμαστὸν ἄρα εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν ῥαδιουργῆσαί τινες ἐπιβέβληνται γραφῶν. Ap. Euseb. H. E. iv. 23.

† Μακάριοί, φησιν, οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται. ἤ, ὡς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια, Μακάριοί, φησιν, οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔσονται τέλειοι. Stromata, iv. 6.

‡ "*Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis cognoscit nisi filius et cui voluerit filius revelare.* Sic et Matthaeus posuit et Lucas similiter, et Marcus idem ipsum. Joannes enim praeterit locum hunc. Hi autem qui peritiores apostolis volunt esse, sic describunt: *Nemo cog-*

too speaks of *adulterators* of the Scriptures (adulteratores).*

From the operation then of various causes, not merely from the carelessness of transcribers and negligence of Christians generally, or the unavoidable mistakes that happen to all documents which are multiplied in copies and transmitted from one generation to another, but from caprice, adventurousness, design, many errors had got into the New Testament text in the middle of the second century and afterwards. The text had been corrupted at the close of the second century both from accidental and intentional alterations.

We have spoken before of A.D. 127 as the proper commencement of the latter class of alterations, or at least as the best commencing point for them which can be obtained in history, although they could not have been wholly new even then. And why has this time been selected? Because Marcion then went to Rome with his *apostolicon* or collection of Paul's epistles; and we learn something both of him and his peculiar treatment of the text from various writers. In the explanations, insertions, alterations he had in his collection of the sacred books, are presented the beginnings of textual changes which may be distinctly traced in subsequent writers, and are even capable of classification to a certain extent. His collection of the sacred books was the largest, if not the earliest that had been made; and the very fact of bringing so many together into one volume drew more attention to them, and gave rise to peculiar changes in the text.

But it will immediately be asked in relation to Marcion,

novit patrem nisi filius, nec filium nisi pater et cui voluerit filius revelare: et interpretantur, quasi a nullo cognitus sit verus Deus ante Domini nostri adventum, et eum Deum, qui a prophetis sit annuntiatus, dicunt non esse patrem Christi."—Advers. Haeres. iv. 6. 1.

* "Quid est ergo: non ex sanguine neque ex voluntate viri, sed ex Deo nati sunt? Hoc quidem capitulo ego potius utar, quum adulteratores ejus obduxero," &c.—De Carne Christi, cap. 19.

does he not stand out from the Catholic Christians as *a heretic*, and should not his treatment of the text be regarded as peculiar on that account? If he proceeded to treat the letter of scripture unceremoniously, would orthodox believers do the same? Would they not rather handle it in an opposite way? And does not this follow from their statements respecting his *falsification* of the text? His treatment of it can have nothing in common with theirs. On the contrary, their accusations of him shew that they acted very differently.

In answer to these questions and conclusions we must look at Marcion a little more nearly. It is quite true that he is the heretic most blamed by the fathers for falsifying the text. They accuse him of corrupting and mutilating Luke's gospel. And there is good ground for that charge. It is clear from Tertullian's testimony that he partly *falsified* the gospel of Luke, and supplied it, in part, with extracts from other gospels. In like manner, it is asserted by Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Epiphanius, that he *falsified* the epistles. But this latter charge must be received with caution. It may be true in some cases, but it is not certainly well founded in all. We believe that it holds to a certain extent. The testimonies of the very fathers who bring the accusation do not fully substantiate it. Some of his readings which depart from the common text are grounded on the authority of MSS. Others are not only derived from MSS., but from correct ones. Others are mistakes which may be innocently committed. A few are *wilful corruptions* made to favour his own system. That the accusations of the fathers are exaggerated is plain from the fact that Tertullian and Epiphanius contradict one another in their statements respecting him. Thus the former cites *trifling corruptions* from the Thessalonian epistles; while the latter declares that those epistles were *thoroughly perverted*. In like manner Tertullian speaks of *small alterations* in the epistle to the Philippians, and says that the letter to Philemon was

unscathed; while Epiphanius pronounces both epistles *wholly corrupted* by Marcion. Let us look at some of the passages which he is accused of corrupting.

According to Tertullian* he is said to have interpolated οἷς οὐδέ in Gal. ii. 5. But this reading is the prevailing one among the Greek and Latin fathers. Doubtless he found it in MSS. And it is the right form of the text.

Again, we find from Jerome† that he omitted a number of verses in Gal. iii. 6-9, from καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ till σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. The words of Tertullian‡ also favour the idea that Marcion erased something in this place. But this passage might have been left out unintentionally, especially as Ἀβραάμ stands at the beginning and end of it. There may have been here an omission by ὁμοιοτέλευτον. Perhaps this is more probable, since the sentiments expressed in the present passage are also contained in the fourth chapter of the epistle, as well as in the fourth of the epistle to the Romans, where Marcion made no alteration.

In 1 Thes. ii. 15 Marcion reads τοὺς ἰδίους προφήτας where Tertullian had in his copy τοὺς προφήτας. But Marcion's reading was doubtless in MSS., for many still have it.

In Ephes. iii. 9 ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, the preposition ἐν was wanting in his copy probably through oversight.

Epiphanius charged him with having δολοῖ in Gal. v. 9, whereas he reads ζυμοῖ. Here however weighty authorities support the heretic.

In 1 Corinth. ix. 8 Marcion reads εἰ καὶ ὁ νόμος Μωυσέως ταῦτα οὐ λέγει, whereas Epiphanius reads ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει. Here there appears to have been no falsification. Probably ἢ and εἰ were interchanged by *itacism*.

In 1 Corinth x. 19, 20, Marcion reads τί οὖν φημί, ὅτι ἱερόθυτόν τί ἐστιν, ἢ εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν; ἀλλ' κ. τ. λ.; but Epiphanius

* Advers. Marcion, lib. v. 3. † Comment. in epist. ad. Galat.

‡ Advers. Marcion, v 3.

has τί οὖν φημί, ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν ; ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύουσι, &c. Here ἱερόθυτον was a gloss upon εἰδωλόθυτον, which was ignorantly taken into the text, so that Marcion's copy had both.

In 1 Corinth. xiv. 19, Marcion reads διὰ τὸν νόμον, but Epiphanius τῷ νοΐ μου. Here there was an evident blunder. Perhaps it arose from διὰ τοῦ νοός μου being appended as an explanation to τῷ νοΐ μου.

Again in Eph. v. 31, either the words και κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικί, or simply τῇ γυναικί were wanting in Marcion's copy. Many authorities omit the former, and if the latter only was left out, it must have been purely accidental, for no sense is given by it.

In 1 Corinth. xv. 45, Marcion is also accused by Tertullian* of falsifying the passage by reading ὁ ἔσχατος κύριος instead of ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ. So too with xv. 47, where instead of ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ he is said to have first written ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

In 2 Thes. i. 8 he left out ἐν πυρὶ φλογός *purposely* according to Tertullian.†

In Eph. ii. 15 he read τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκί without αὐτοῦ, and connected ἔχθρα ἐν σαρκί so as to be equivalent to σαρκική. This was a wilful corruption. ‡ In like manner in ii. 20, καὶ προφητῶν was omitted through a bad motive. §

There was an omission in Colos. i. 16, with which Tertullian charges him that must have been intentional, viz. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται. This evidently appears a falsification of the passage, as well as the omission of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως in the preceding verse. ‖ The same father Tertullian also complains of important corruptions in the epistle to the Romans on Marcion's part, but does not specify any. It appears that he omitted from x. 5 to xi. 32, so that xi. 33 follows x. 4. ¶

* Adv. Marc. v. 10. † Ibid, v. 16. ‡ Ibid, c. 17. § Ibid. ‖ Ibid, c. 19. ¶ Ibid, c. 14.

In 2 Corinth. iv. 13, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα was wanting in Marcion's copy, according to Epiphanius. It is not clear whether this was an intentional omission or not. Probably it was designed.

Such is a specimen of Marcion's readings gathered from his two chief accusers Tertullian and Epiphanius. We do not deny that the charges against him were true in part, even in respect to the epistles of Paul. Origen* blames him for jumbling together the last two chapters of the epistle to the Romans; and we have no reason to doubt the statement. We have also seen that Tertullian speaks of extensive mutilations in the epistle to the Romans, for which statement there was reason. And in the case of various passages, the omission of important words or sentences must have proceeded from a bad motive. But he was not to blame for all his readings. Many instances laid to his account are innocent mistakes. In them his readings are very much like those current in orthodox copies. *His* corruptions were often similar to *theirs*. His readings in part should be treated as of the same kind with those found in Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. We intend therefore to quote some of them as belonging to the same class and originating in similar causes; to which the strong word *falsification* should not be applied. We shall not do Irenaeus or Clement any injustice by placing their readings in the same category with those of Marcion; neither shall we do a favour to Marcion which he deserves not. Heretic though he was, he should be treated justly. Doubtless he had very little regard for the text of Scripture in many places; but the fathers who have accused him have been more zealous than discreet in all their charges.

Other heretics are accused of falsifying the text. Thus Tatian is said to have made alterations in the Pauline epistles. The Valentinians are also charged by Irenaeus with an altera-

* Comment. in epist. ad Rom. ad. cap. xvi. 25.

tion in Matt. xi. 27. When Tertullian accuses them of changing the singular into the plural John i. 13, the plural is the right reading.*

It will appear from these observations that allowance should be made for the warmth and enthusiastic zeal of the fathers in bringing forward accusations of this nature. They were by no means cool, calm, and critical in their procedure; and therefore their assertions must be adopted with caution. They cannot be safely relied on, without an examination of the probable foundation on which they proceed. In whatever way the falsifications of the New Testament text on the part of the earliest heretics be viewed, the departures from the true reading that flowed from the source in question into MSS. generally, must have been inconsiderable. *Some* wilful corruptions made by Marcion did certainly get into various copies, but they never obtained an extensive footing. The orthodox church was awake to the importance of preserving their holy writings from the contamination of heretical hands, and prevented any material falsification. The heretics were comparatively few, and did not possess sufficient influence, even had they been so disposed, to corrupt the records extensively. The catholic christians, scattered as they were through many lands, opposed a barrier to radical alterations. The corruptions that took place *within* the catholic church were far more serious in their influence than those made out of it; because they were liable to be propagated and perpetuated. As long as one had not been hereticated for his doctrinal views, he might add, take away, and confound readings without exposure to suspicion. This is plain from the fact that Ptolemy, nearly contemporary with Marcion, quoted passages from Matthew, John, and Paul, with some peculiarities resembling those originating with Marcion himself, and yet, so far as is known, without being accused on that account of falsification.

* De Carne Christi, c. 19.

Thus he omitted τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Corinth. ii. 14, without giving offence. He added to Matt. v. 39 ὅλως; to δωρον, τῷ θεῷ in Matt. xv. 5; ὁ πατήρ after εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός, in Matt. xix. 17; οὐκ οἶδα to καὶ τί εἴπω in John xii. 27. He also altered τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν into τ. π. τῶν πρεσβυτέρων in Matt. xv. 6.*

Thus we may treat in many instances the readings found in the works of the early heretics and in those of the orthodox as similar. Taking them together as far as they can be justly associated, the question recurs, what indications do they afford of the state of the text about the middle and towards the close of the second century? What kind of corruption had it undergone. We must believe the writers who speak of falsifications in the records, though in some cases attaching a meaning to the word different from that intended by such as employed it; and above all, we must conclude from the works themselves of the catholic fathers belonging to this part of the century, that many alterations had been made in the text. As has been already hinted, the varieties of it are even capable of classification to some extent.

First. As much greater attention was given to the New Testament writings when *put together* in a greater or less collection, passages must have been observed in which the same ideas, events, or sayings were differently expressed. In the second century, such diversities of expression began to be noted either in the margin of copies or above the lines; the consequence of which was, that transcribers afterwards changed one expression for another, formed a new phrase out of several synonymous ones, or connected together various expressions descriptive of the same thing. Something like this must have been done by the persons whom Clement censures as μετατιθέντες τὰ εὐαγγέλια. The gospels were peculiarly liable to such treatment, as they contain so much that is alike. But other parts of the

* Ptolemaei ep. ad Floram, in Epiphanii, oper. p. 216, ed. Petav.

New Testament, though of course in a much less degree, were not exempted from it.

Thus in Matt. x. 26, where was written at first οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται, some one had written beside or above it, οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερωθήσεται οὐδὲ κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, which latter had displaced the other in copies before Clement's time.

In Luke iii. 22 are the words σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου. Beside them had been written the next words of the Psalm, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, which were afterwards taken into the text itself, so that Clement, Justin, and other early authorities found here ὁ υἱός μου εἶ, σύ, ἐγω σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

In Luke xvi. 9 there had been inserted at the end of the verse εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει. This was taken into the text, and then for the sake of connecting it with the next verse, was added λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ πιστός, &c.

Marcion had μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγερθῆναι instead of καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι, Luke ix. 22. This was doubtless derived from a parallel place, and is in other authorities.

In John vi. 51 we have ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστὶν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, where the clause ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω is a gloss formed from the analogy of the preceding ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω. This gloss is older than Clement.

In Acts xv. 20 τοῦ πνικτοῦ had been taken from the parallel in xxi. 25, and inserted prior to Clement's day.

In Mark xv. 28 there was inserted from Matthew and Luke καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα: καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογισθη. The addition is found in Origen.*

Secondly. In explaining and enforcing various doctrines drawn from the New Testament, diversities of exposition arose out of diversity of terms employed; and in cases of dispute it was judged best to take words in the sense in which they were

* Eichhorn's Einleitung in das neue Testament, vol. iv. pp. 223, 224.

used in the apostles' time. This gave rise to an *exegetical tradition* which was marked in the margin of the text, but also occasionally inserted in the text itself.

Matt. i. 18 has τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις οὕτως ἦν. Irenaeus nas τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις. So other authorities. The omission of Ἰησοῦ arose from taking γέννησις, or as others read γένεσις, to refer to his eternal generation, not his nativity.

In Romans iii. 26 the original reading appears to have been, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως. Over αὐτὸν some one first wrote Ἰησοῦν. A transcriber, not knowing well where it should be, placed it at the end of the text——τὸν ἐκ πίστεως, Ἰησοῦν, as Clement has it. And because the accusative Ἰησοῦν does not give a good sense, it was altered into Ἰησοῦ the genitive, as it is in very ancient MSS.

In Matt. i. 25 αὐτης τὸν πρωτότοκον was left out in some very old MSS, lest it might be thought that Mary had children afterwards.*

Thirdly. Amid uniformity of diction it was perceived that considerable diversity existed. In one part of the collection of sacred writings the mode of expression was obscure, in another more perspicuous; in one more complete, in another more condensed and abridged; in one more definite, in another more vague; in one the usual form of expression, in another an unusual one. Hence, for the purpose of making every thing more intelligible, words and phrases not agreeable to the Greek idiom were made more conformable to it; obscure were rendered more easy of apprehension; unknown and unusual were explained by well known phraseology, and *metaphrases* or verbal translations placed in the margin or between the lines of the text. It is said that *metaphrases* were made by Tatian on Paul's epistles.

Examples are such as these:—

* Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. iv. pp. 225, 226.

Luke ii. 49, οὐκ οἴδατε is the reading both of Irenaeus and Tertullian for οὐκ ἤδειτε.

Luke xii. 38, ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ. Marcion has τῇ ἑσπερινῇ φυλακῇ. The same is found in D.

Luke xix. 26, τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται. Clement has προστεθήσεται; D. προστίθεται; several cursive MSS., the Vulgate and Ethiopic, add to δοθήσεται, καὶ περισσευθήσεται.

Rev. i. 15, πόδες——ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένοι. Irenaeus reads πεπυρωμένῳ.

1 Corinth. xv. 49. Instead of φορέσομεν Irenaeus and most of the uncial MSS. have φορέσωμεν in a hortatory sense.

In Luke xi. 54 the right reading is ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν, θηρεῦσαί τι. But very early there was written as a gloss over or beside ἐνεδρεύοντες the more common ζητοῦντες, which was afterwards taken into the text and joined to ἐνεδρ. by καὶ. Hence the words ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτόν, for which the gloss was substituted, are wanting in the old Latin and D.

Luke xix. 26, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Marcion reads δοκεῖ ἔχειν.

Luke xii. 27, οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει. Clement has οὔτε νήθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει. So too D.

1 Peter i. 8. Irenaeus, and before him Polycarp, has the passage with a glossarial word inserted, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύετε, πιστεύοντες δὲ κ. τ. λ.

In like manner something was omitted. Thus κληθῇς εἰς γάμους, as Clement reads Luke xiv. 8 without ὑπό τινος; ἀνάπεσαι εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον, Luke xiv. 10, without πορευθείς, which is also changed εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον ἀνάπιπτε, as Clement has it with D.; πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, Matt. xviii. 10, where ἐν οὐρανοῖς is omitted by Clement and others.

Acts iv. 31, ἐλάλουν . . . . . μετὰ παῤῥησίας. Irenaeus and others have it in a more definite form, μετὰ παῤῥησίας παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεύειν. In Luke viii. 42, Marcion has καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι. The usual text is ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν.

Fourthly. Some circumstances as related gave offence or excited suspicion. Hence something was supplied which appeared necessary to justify their credibility, or desirable to supplement the narrative. It was this that gave rise to the words of Acts viii. 37, "if thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." A confession of faith on the part of the Ethiopian eunuch appeared to be wanting, and it was inserted accordingly. Irenaeus has the addition to the text.

Fifthly. Synonymes are exchanged, as in

Matt. x. 42, *μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.* Cyprian and many other authorities have *μὴ ἀπόληται ὁ μισθός.*

Matt. xv. 6, *ἠκυρώσατε τὴν εντολήν.* Ptolemy in his epistle to Flora has *τὸν νόμον.*

Matt. xxiii. 27, *οἵτινες ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται ὡραῖοι.* Clement and Irenaeus read *ἔξωθεν ὁ τάφος φαίνεται ὡραῖος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμει.*

Luke xiii. 27, *οἱ ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας.* Origen has *ἀνομίας.*

Luke xix. 5, *σήμερον γάρ.* Irenaeus and others read *ὅτι σήμερον.*

Luke vi. 29, *πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.* Ptolemy reads *στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἀλλήν.*

Luke xii. 48, *περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν.* Clement has *πλεῖον ἀπαιτήσουσιν.**

The preceding observations will serve to shew, that the deviations from the current text as it now is, were many during the first two centuries. It must be borne in mind too, that the means existing for the investigation of the subject are very scanty. If so much can be gathered from occasional quotations of the New Testament in the remaining works of very few fathers besides two, Irenaeus and Clement, a conclusion may be fairly drawn as to the manifold diversities presented by the text. But other sources of investigation soon appear, from which the prospect is not more favourable. The disorder does not lessen as our means of ascertaining it increase. Towards

* Eichhorn's Einleitung, vol. iv. pp. 228, 229.

the end of the second century two ancient translations were made, viz. the old Latin and the old Syriac, at the basis of which lay a Greek text somewhat older. Both represent the state of the text in the second century. And from them it is apparent how different were the copies whence they were taken from our present ones, in the two countries where they originated. It is true that the testimony of these witnesses to the state of the Greek text is necessarily imperfect because of their being in other languages. It is also deteriorated in consequence of the changes made in them since they appeared. Their own texts have suffered. Besides, they deviate from one another in a way embarrassing to the critic. But though it is somewhat difficult to discover, especially in regard to the old Latin, what was its original text, yet we may in most cases gather from passages in the Latin fathers of the third and fourth centuries cited from it, its near approximation to the original. It was literal at first, and is still literal; so that the critic may see with much probability what the Greek was which the translator had before him, *i. e.* the text as it was in the second century. If the two most ancient Latin fathers Tertullian and Cyprian be taken and their quotations examined, it will be seen that the Greek text discovered through the *versio vetus* they quote was extensively altered. It had suffered much from causes already mentioned. Let us look at it through the version in question.

In John iii. 6 the received reading is τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστιν, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, πνεῦμα ἐστιν. This is quoted by Tertullian,* *quod in carne natum est caro est, quia ex carne natum est; et quod de spiritu natum est, spiritus est, quia Deus spiritus est et de Deo natus est.* Here the first additional clause ὅτι ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐγεννήθη is in many authorities, which may be seen in Scholz. The second addition ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστιν is also not confined to Tertullian. The

* De Carne Christi, cap. xviii.

third, *quia Deus spiritus est, et de* (or ex) *Deo natus est*, is well supported. All are explanatory insertions.

In Mark xiii. 2 Cyprian* has, "*et post triduum aliud excitabitur sine manibus.*" This clause was borrowed from xiv. 58 and put into the present place. It is also in D., where the Greek is καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν.

In Luke xviii. 14 the common text stands thus, δεδικαιωμένος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐκεῖνος. Cyprian† has *descendit hic justificatus in domum suam magis quam ille Pharisaeus.* This agrees with D. and other authorities, μᾶλλον παρ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν Φαρισαῖον. The addition was made *exegetically.*

Acts iv. 8, πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Cyprian has‡ *Seniores Israelis, audite.* In like manner ἀκούσατε is in other authorities.

Acts iv. 32. After ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία Cyprian reads§ *nec fuit inter illos discrimen ullum.* This is also in D., καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία. A gloss was taken into the text.

1 John ii. 17. After μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα Cyprian has‖ *quomodo Deus manet in aeternum.* Others have the same addition.

The diversities in single words are very numerous.

In 1 Corinth. xv. 51, the received text has πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα· πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα. This is quoted by Tertullian,¶ *omnes quidem resurgemus, non autem omnes demutabimur.*

In Acts ii. 38 the common reading, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is enlarged by the prefix of τοῦ κυρίου in Cyprian** and other Latin fathers, that Christ's full dignity might be put into the passage.

* Advers. Judaeos, lib. 1, cap. xv. † De Oratione dominica.
‡ Advers. Judaeos, lib. 2, cap. xvi.
§ De Opere et Eleemosynis, sub. finem.
‖ Testimon. ad Quirinum, lib. iii. 11. ¶ De Anima, cap. xlii.
** Epist. ad Jubaianum.

In Acts iii. 19 ὑμῖν is inserted in different places according to different authorities, either after ἐλθωσι or ἀναψύξεως. It was taken from the margin.

2 Corinth. xi. 14, ὡς for εἰς in Cyprian* and the old Latin.

The Peshito or old Syriac exhibits the same kind of arbitrary alterations. It is true that we have no Syrian fathers nearly contemporary with the origin of this version, from whose quotations it might be shewn that the translator had a Greek text before him with changes similar to those of the old Latin. But we learn from the works of Ephrem the Syrian, about the middle of the fourth century, that the Peshito then had many peculiarities in its text similar to or identical with those of the old Latin and the Cambridge MS. or D.

Thus in Matt. vi. 15 the common text has ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν. But in the Peshito, Ephrem, D. &c., ἀφήσει ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

Matt. x. 10, μὴ πήραν. The Syriac and Ephrem have, μηδὲ πήραν, *neque perum*.

Matt. xii. 14, οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες. The Syriac and Ephrem read, καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ.

Matt. xiii. 28, οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι εἶπον αὐτῷ. The Syriac and Ephrem, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ δοῦλοι. So the old Latin, *dicunt ei servi*.

Luke xi. 34. For ὅλον the Syriac and Ephrem read πᾶν. So also D.

Luke xiv. 5. The received text has ὄνος ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ ἐμπεσεῖται καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου. The Syriac and Ephrem read, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτόν.

John x. 16, καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω. The Syriac and Ephrem read, καὶ ἀλλὰ δέ. The Cambridge MS. also has *et alias autem oves*.

* De Unitate ecclesiae.

John xi. 39, λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος. Here the Syriac and Ephrem have *Martha* inserted before ἡ ἀδελφή. In like manner the Cambridge MS., *dicit ei Martha* (soror defuncti erat). The Colbert MS. has also *Martha*.

How then are we to deal with this problem of manifold and extensive alterations in the text of the New Testament, in the second century. Many of them exhibit the marks of industry and design, else they would not have been so numerous, and so much scattered throughout all the books of the New Testament. It appears remarkable that such liberties should be taken with books so highly esteemed and so authoritative. And yet the Christians were not deterred from officious meddling with them. Such insertions, omissions, and substitutions of one word for another, were owing to the practices of those who read the lessons from Scripture in the churches, to the presbyters, to grammarians and transcribers. And as there was much intercourse between the churches, the mother-church having a watchful care over those subject to it, the copies prepared and used in the one, were transmitted to the smaller and inferior ones.

In the first half of the third century we have an express and definite testimony relative to the degenerate state of the text and the causes of it. Origen, the first critical reader of the Scriptures who had appeared in those times, speaks of the condition of *the gospels;* and he was most competent to give a just opinion on the subject. Though he refers to the *gospels* particularly, yet we are warranted in applying what he says to the other books of the New Testament likewise, with the deduction that parallels were more frequently inserted in the gospels than elsewhere. The passage in which this father alludes to the corruption of the text occurs in his commentaries on Matthew's gospel: "But now without doubt there is a great diversity of copies, whether it has arisen from the indolence of certain scribes, or from the boldness of some who make

irksome emendations, or from the procedure of such as add or take away what pleases them in the correction of MSS."* According to these words, the corruption of the text is referred to three sources, the carelessness of transcribers, the caprice of those who undertook the revision or correction of copies, and the meddling of critics who ventured upon improvements according to their own judgment and so added or omitted.

In examining Origen's Greek works—for those which exist only in a Latin translation are too uncertain to be relied on—we find the same varieties of reading that occur in the oldest fathers as well as the old Latin and Peshito versions. Indeed he often agrees with them in their peculiar reading of a passage. If he does not, the forms of the text they present can be paralleled in other places of the Alexandrine fathers. It is also natural to expect that the readings of Clement and Origen should generally coincide, the one having been the pupil of the other, and living at the same place.

Additions from apocryphal writings and from parallel passages occur in Origen. Thus he has, along with Clement and Eusebius, in Matt. vi. 33, *αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται, κ. τ. λ.*

In Matt. vii. 22, *κύριε, κύριε, οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐφάγομεν, καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐπίομεν.* Origen has these words four times.

In Matt. x. 26, *οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν, ὃ οὐ φανερωθήσεται, οὐδὲ κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, κ. τ. λ.* instead of *οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, κ. τ. λ.* Here Origen and Clement agree, except that the former has *καὶ οὐδὲν* for *οὐδέ*.

In Luke ix. 27, for *ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, Origen has along with D. *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ* from parallel places.

* *Νυνὶ δὲ δηλονότι πολλὴ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ ῥᾳθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων.* Comment. in Matt. xv.

Even the single readings which are found in the old Latin and Syriac versions are repeated by Origen, doubtless out of the MSS. he used. It is evident therefore that they were at that time scattered through many MSS. Thus, in the gospels, Matt. xi. 19, the received text has τέκνων. But Origen, as well as the Vetus, the old Syriac, and other sources read ἔργων. In Matt. iii. 6, ποταμῷ is added to Ἰωρδάνῃ in Origen (twice), the Peshito, and other ancient authorities taken from Mark i. 5.

In Matt. v. 27 τοῖς ἀρχαίοις is omitted in the Peshito, several MSS. of the Vetus, and Origen.

In Matt. v. 44, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς stands in the received text. This clause is omitted by Tertullian, Cyprian the old Italic in various MSS. and other Latin authorities, as well as by Origen seven times. It is *properly* omitted.

Matt. xxi. 1. The common text has ἤγγισαν . . . . ἦλθον. But the Peshito and Origen have ἤγγισεν . . . . . ἦλθεν.

Matt. xxi. 33, ἄνθρωπος τις. The old Latin and Origen read without τις, as in Luke xx. 9. And they are right.

Luke ix. 23, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν. The last two words καθ' ἡμέραν are omitted in several copies of the old Latin and in Origen.

John v. 26, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ Χριστός. The ἀληθῶς is rightly omitted by the old Latin, Origen, and other authorities.

In the Acts and Epistles the following may suffice :—

Acts xvi. 16. Here the common text has πνεῦμα πύθωνος. The old Latin and Origen have πύθωνα, perhaps rightly.

1 Corinth. xv. 29. The received text has τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν. The old Latin, Ephrem, and Origen have ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, perhaps properly.

But though Origen was disinclined to follow the practices of those transcribers, revisers, and arbitrary critics, who made very free with the New Testament text, he did not himself

wholly refrain from conjectural emendation of it. Yet he did not insert what appeared most probable to him in the text itself. He put it into his commentaries. Wise as this procedure was, it gave rise to corruptions; for his admirers and followers took and placed either in the margin of MSS. or between the lines, many of these conjectural emendations, whence they were afterwards copied by transcribers into the text itself. Hence several varieties of reading which appear even in existing MSS. were derived from the works of Origen.

But although the Greek text as seen through Origen's quotations corresponds to its state as observed in earlier Greek fathers and in the oldest translators—though the peculiarities of reading found in the earlier fathers and most ancient versions can usually be paralleled in him—yet we do not say that they are as frequent in his writings as we should have expected them to be had they simply progressed by the usual multiplication of copies. Origen himself was a better critic than any of his predecessors. He had given far more attention to the Scriptures. Hence there is little doubt that he did something towards restraining the arbitrary procedure he had observed. He perpetuated it indeed in part, but he did something to check it. Doubtless he amended in some parts such copies as passed through his hands. So little however was his influence felt, that the corruption was in his day much the same as in that of his preceptor Clement.

The same state of the text as is observed in the writings of the fathers belonging to the second century, especially in the Peshito version, is contained in an existing MS. We allude to the Cambridge MS. or D., which throws much light on the history of the text during the period we are investigating. For though it was written in the sixth century, yet the text at the basis of it belongs to the commencement of the third. This is apparent from the minute and masterly exami-

nation to which Hug has subjected it,* shewing that the peculiarities of its text owed its origin to the causes already mentioned. Hence we find similar corruptions of the Greek text in it to those in the Peshito, Clement, and Origen. But the additions and insertions made in it are larger and more strongly marked, not only because it was taken directly from a copy or copies which originated after those current in the first days of the Peshito and old Latin, but from other causes peculiar to itself.

The brief sketch now given of the Greek text, as far as it can be gathered from the fathers and the oldest versions, will help to shew what it was in the second century and to the middle of the third. The memorials of it were on the whole alike. It was in a corrupt condition, to which various causes had contributed; carelessness probably the least. Arbitrary alterations had been made in it. The difference between MSS. lay not so much in the nature of the corruptions, for here there was a general resemblance, as in the number of them. One had more passages in which the original reading was disfigured than another. This difference in the number of variations must have depended on a variety of causes, on time, country, the use for which a MS. was destined or to which it was applied, the number of hands through which it passed. Many copies owed their peculiar text solely to the transcriber, many to revisers, many to their possessors. It is likely that copies containing parts of the New Testament intended for public reading departed most from the original text; private MSS. for individual use, the least. Although therefore the corruptions of the text as it was current in the first half of the third century may be divided into various classes, we must not expect particulars that can be ranged under each class in any one document. Two or three documents must be taken

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 124, et seq.

together, out of which all the classes, with particular cases exemplifying them, may be collected.

It is useless to speculate on the country or countries whence this disordered state of the text proceeded at first. It may have been in Asia and Greece. Probably it was so. Its characteristics in different lands have also been investigated, but with too much subtlety to be distinctly recognised and admitted. *Peculiar* corruptions, it is thought, prevailed in Asia, northern Africa, Egypt. This may have been and probably was the case to *some extent;* but not to *such* an extent as to make the distinctions palpable and marked.

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT AFTER THE MIDDLE OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

It has been thought by Hug and others, that after the first half of the third century the text began to assume a different form. Whether this form brought it nearer to the original one is not now the question. Is it a fact that it underwent perceptible and extensive changes after the period stated? If so, the inquiry arises, how was this effected? Was it owing to mere accident; or were other causes in operation adequate to produce it? Did criticism begin now, having been inoperative before? How is it known or supposed that after the middle of the third century *revision* came to be practised. It has been gathered from an examination of the oldest existing MSS., versions, and interpreters belonging to the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. Looking at these together, and comparing them with one another, critics have speculated largely about their character and peculiarities. We do not deny that they indicate, for the first time, something different in the later from the earlier fate of the text—a difference between the treatment it met with in the second century for example, from that to which it was subjected in the third. But we demur to the conclusion that new causes in the third century, or if it be preferred in the fourth, produced new effects. A *palpable* transition from one period to another

has been made, which tends to convey a false notion of the state of the case. The same causes were in operation before as after the last half of the third century. There was always some attention paid to the text, with a view to keep it free from gross corruptions. But now *more persons* began to correct it. Causes hitherto operating produced fruit more extensively now. There were more critics and grammarians in Alexandria, who exerted an influence on the books of neighbouring countries. But we must not think of anything like *a general revision* of the text conducted on certain principles. *The revisions*, if they may be called so, were partial, fitful, arbitrary. Indeed the term *revision* or *recension*, corresponding to *edition* in a printed book, is inapplicable. What have been termed *recensions* have been more the result of accidental circumstances than of *pervading design*.

Bearing in mind these observations, let us proceed to note the state of opinion among the leading critics respecting such peculiarities of the text as have presented themselves, according to their opinion, in a comparison of the earliest MSS., versions, and interpreters, with one another, as well as with more recent documents.

The question suggested itself to the mind of speculating collators and editors, how comes it to pass that the text of the New Testament began to assume a form distinguished from the earlier one by characteristic peculiarities? The old answer was, that the causes already in operation must be looked to. Had this answer been deemed satisfactory, the criticism of the New Testament would not have been in its present state. It would not have passed through a variety of phases.

According to former views every MS. which was not a copy of another, every ancient version which proceeded from a MS. of this kind, every citation in the fathers made independently of a critical source, must have had separate, individual voices; and the leading canon of criticism would have been,

as many independent MSS., versions, and citations, *so many* separate authorities are there.

But when critics began to look closely at the phenomena, they thought of philosophising about them. In the sources of New Testament criticism they met with so many harmonious and discordant peculiarities as led them to believe that the usual causes of corruption were insufficient to account for them. The documents of antiquity, whether they be MSS. or versions made directly from the original, agree with one another in certain characteristic readings; and it was thought, therefore, that they naturally distributed themselves into *classes*. It is true that this general agreement does not extend through all the parts of a MS. or version; yet it can be traced in portions of them. It runs through whole books of the New Testament, occasionally even through the entire canon. If a peculiar various reading, for example, be found in a MS. or version; the same will commonly exist in a series or class of MSS. and versions.

It was also supposed that such harmony and disagreement in the sources of New Testament criticism is capable of geographical and ethnographical determination. Egyptian, Byzantine, Palestinian, Western writers cite according to forms of the text characteristically similar. The same holds good of all the leading MSS. whose country is known, and of all primary versions. Their text varies according to the different places where it belonged. Taking a certain circuit of country, the characteristic readings of such documents as first appeared there, or of such as were derived from the primary memorials belonging to the locality in question, are alike. They present a corresponding configuration, for example, in *the West* generally.

Such peculiarities appeared in the eyes of critics to betray *design*. They seemed to be the result of a critical handling ot

the text, and that too not conducted arbitrarily, but agreeably to certain modes. Local causes contributed something; but it was conjectured they had no more than a secondary and inferior influence. The main cause was thought to be an industrious revision of the text. Various individuals seeing the corrupted state of the original records in relation to their words, and lamenting, as Origen did, that the codices were so very unlike one another, were prompted to do something to remedy the defect. They were not content to sit still, and allow it to continue and increase. Hence critical revisions of the text were undertaken by different scholars in different countries, quite independently of one another, so early as the third century. They did not, as we might suppose, apply the very same means to the correction of the disorder. Had they done so, the results would not have been characteristically diverse. After they had accomplished their task, the improved copy would be multiplied by transcripts and circulated throughout the region where the reviser himself was, as well as throughout a wider territory connected by ecclesiastical and literary influences.

Such was the state at which opinion had arrived through the speculations of Griesbach and Hug. The latter, improving upon the system devised by his predecessor, brought it to something like what has been stated, choosing the middle of the third century for the time when the text in different countries began to assume different appearances and forms.

Bentley was the first who gave tolerably plain intimations of a classification of MSS. It is strange that the idea did not suggest itself, or at least was not expressed by Mill. But Bengel perceived more clearly than his predecessor certain characteristic peculiarities according to which the critical materials of the New Testament might be classified. Yet he had a faint idea of the fact, compared with Griesbach.

Semler saw it much more distinctly, though by no means so definitely as would have led him to apply it to any extent.*

The hypothesis was afterwards developed by Griesbach with great ingenuity. He was the first to give precision and fixedness to the hints which had been previously thrown out by Bengel and Semler; by investigating the subject with much critical tact and acuteness. The characteristic forms of the text he called after Semler *recensions*, a name which has been more generally adopted than any other, whether *family*, *class*, or ἔκδοσις, *i.e. editio*. Perhaps some other appellation such as *class*, would have been more appropriate. Certainly it is less liable to misconception. When therefore one speaks of *recensions* of the New Testament text, he means, according to Griesbach's view, the different conformations in which it was commonly circulated in different circles and countries, arising either from critical revisions conducted on a definite plan, or from certain general and local causes.

This definite arrangement has *indirectly* facilitated the *practical* criticism of the Greek text, for MSS. versions, and

* "Codices nec sunt omnes ex una recensione Graeca descripti nec antiquioris recensionis (qua utebatur Origenes, Eusebius, et Latina translatio ante Hieronymum, ex qua et Copta fere est, et quæ ex Syriaca posteriori adnotatur) multa exempla ad nos venerunt. Haec fuit simplicior, rudior, antiquior recensio; brevior etiam et minus verbosa; ab ea recedit alia, quæ fere hoc eodem tempore Origenis sub initium certe seculi quarti in Orientis provinciis solebant jam describi. Antiochiæ et per Orientem seculo quarto obtinuerit recensio Græca alia, recentior, impurior. Chrysostomus et seriores scriptores hoc tantum textu utuntur, et differunt fere ab eo, quem secutæ erant vetustiores translationes. Diversa Græca recensio, quæ olim locum habuit, pro provinciarum diversitate fere obtinuit; Alexandrinam facile distinguere licet, Ægyptiacis scriptoribus et Origenis discipulis fere communem, ad Syros Coptas Æthiopas etiam vulgatam; alia per Orientem (Antiochiæ atque inde Constantinopoli, &c.) valebat; alia per Occidentem. Inde cum Origenis et Pelagii odium crevisset, ecclesiastica quædam et mixta recensio sensim orta est e plurium provinciarum codicibus, qua adhuc uti solemus."—Apparatus ad liberatem N. T. interpretationem, p. 45.

patristic quotations are no longer counted, and reckoned according to their individual independent voices; but the entire mass of materials is separated into classes, which again are either subdivided or may be so. No recension of the text has been preserved pure and unaltered in MSS. versions, or copies used by the fathers. All representatives of the recensions now existing are more or less corrupted. From coming in contact with others, each has partially lost its pristine form. There is a mixture greater or less in the texts of such copies as are the offspring and known types of the different recensions. In addition to this, alterations have been introduced by the carelessness or caprice of transcribers. To all the documents belonging to each recension one voice only belongs. The numerous MSS., versions, and citations, including all their degenerate offspring which constitute one recension, have but one voice assigned them in determining the original reading of a passage.

The following is Griesbach's system of recensions:—

1. *The Alexandrine* recension, which proceeded from Egypt and spread over the great majority of countries in the East. This is exhibited by the New Testament citations in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Isidore of Pelusium and others; and in the eighth century by Johannes Damascenus or John of Damascus. The versions of it are the Memphitic and Philoxenian *wholly*, the Ethiopic and Armenian *in part*. The uncial MSS. belonging to it are B. (in the last chapters of Matthew, and in Mark, Luke, and John), C. L. in the gospels, with the cursive ones 33, 102, 106; in the Pauline epistles the uncial codices A. B. C. and in a mixed form the cursive 17, 46, 47. According to Griesbach, this recension was made in the second half of the second century, for it was diffused with all its characteristic peculiarities at the commencement of the third century. Its main characteristic feature is grammatical purity and accuracy.

2. Another recension assumed by the same critic is called

the occidental, represented by the text followed in the quotations of Cyprian, Tertullian, the Latin translator of Irenaeus, Hilary of Poictiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Ambrose, and Augustine. Among the ancient versions it is represented by all the Latin ones, (if there were several), the Sahidic and Jerusalem-Syriac. It is contained in the Greek-Latin MSS. generally; in the gospels, by D. in particular, and by 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157; in the Pauline epistles by D. E. F. G. Griesbach supposes that it originated in the second half of the second century, either at Carthage or Rome, and spread over nearly the entire west. Its main feature is *exegetical*. Hence it is distinguished by paraphrases, glosses, additions of every kind, transpositions of words and clauses, all intended to *elucidate* the text. In it also are the unusual, harsh, Hebraising, and grammatically incorrect expressions of the original text.

3. The *Constantinopolitan* recension, which appears in the writings of almost all the ecclesiastical authors that belonged to Greece, Asia Minor, and other neighbouring countries, from the end of the fourth till the close of the sixth century. Of ancient versions, the Gothic and Slavonic have flowed from its text. Of the uncial MSS. of the gospels it appears in A. E. F. G. H. S; and the Moscow MSS. of Paul's epistles. This recension arose out of the other two. It is properly an amalgamation of both. Oriental MSS. got into the west, and occidental ones into the east, so that the two recensions denominated the Western and Alexandrine were mixed with each other. The leading peculiarity of this recension is, that it exhibits more *Graecisms* than the Alexandrine, *i. e.* it rejects still more Hebraisms and harshnesses than the latter, while it adopts more explanatory glosses. It approaches nearer the received text than any other.

It will be seen that the old Syriac version has not been mentioned as belonging to any of the three recensions. Ac-

cording to Griesbach its text agrees in many cases with the Alexandrine, in more with the Western, in some with the Constantinopolitan. Hence, its text was revised at different times, receiving contributions from different Greek MSS. So too the text of Chrysostom in the gospels is a mixture of various recensions. There are several MSS. too whose text has arisen from the readings of two or three recensions of which P. Q. T. are examples, agreeing as they do sometimes with the Alexandrine, sometimes with the Western. There are MSS. besides which, though belonging in the great majority of their readings to the Constantinopolitan recension, contain at the same time mixed readings out of the other two, such as K. M. 10, 11, 17, 22, 28, 36, 40, 57, 61, 63, 64, 72, 91, 108, 127, 142, 209, 229, 235.

Such an amalgamation has been called by a disciple of Griesbach the *younger Constantinopolitan*, and exalted into a fourth recension. The Ethiopic, Armenian, Sahidic, and Jerusalem-Syriac versions are said to contain interpolated readings belonging to this younger Constantinopolitan, as also the writings of Theophylact and Œcumenius.*

According to Griesbach, the Alexandrine recension was made in the second half of the second century, at the time the two divisions of the New Testament books called the Εὐαγγέλιον and Ἀπόστολος were put together.

As to the occidental, he admitted at one time that the name *recension* was improperly applied to it as well as to the Byzantine, because neither was the revision of any particular critic.

The occidental originated about the same time as the Alexandrine, being derived from ancient copies of single books of the New Testament, or from partial collections of those books,

* Prolegomena in New Testament, vol. i. ed. Schulz, p. 70, et seq.; and Curarum in historiam textus Graeci epistolarum Pauli specimen 1. Opuscula Academica by Gabler, vol. ii. p. 1, et seq.

which were retained or preserved after the union of the εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολος by the Latins or Western christians.

As to the Byzantine, it was made up out of the other two in the fourth century, and gradually changed in the two following.

But it is not easy to give a concise and accurate statement of Griesbach's classification. In various publications he did not always agree with himself. He wavered and altered.

The classification of authorities thus proposed, though ingenious and plausible, was criticised and objected to by many succeeding critics. In Germany it was either found fault with or modified by Eichhorn, Michaelis, Hug, Scholz, Schulz, Rinck, Gabler, Tischendorf, Reiche, De Wette, and others. Dr. Laurence in our own country assailed it with much acuteness and critical ability. It has also been attacked by Norton in America. Criticised therefore as it has been by so many writers, and attacked from so many points, it must be weak and vulnerable. Its credit is indeed gone. Instead of standing the test of public opinion, it has been cast down. In his last publication the distinguished critic himself all but abandoned it.*

The chief objection to it is the distinction made between the Alexandrine and Western recensions. But this was virtually given up by himself after the appearance of Hug's classification.

Let us see what Hug's system is.

1. In the MSS. of the gospels D. 1, 13, 69, 124; of the epistles D. E. F. G., and of the Apocalypse D. E. as also in the old Latin version and the Sahidic, he finds a text substantially the same as the occidental recension of Griesbach. This was the unrevised and corrupted state of the text which had been gradually formed till the middle of the third century.

* Commentarius Criticus in textum graecum Novi Testamenti, Particula ii. p. 41, et seq.

To such disordered form of the text he gives the name κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. It was multiplied by the Alexandrine scribes and circulated chiefly in the west, where MSS. representing it were in common use long after remedies had been applied to the disorder. Hug reckons the old Syriac version, and even the citations of Clement and Origen as belonging to it. In both respects he differs from Griesbach. The latter however afterwards assented in a great degree to Hug's view of the Peshito. But with regard to Clement and Origen he hesitated. He would only allow that the two Alexandrine fathers approximated in some respects to the occidental recension, and shewed that Origen used a western MS. merely in his commentary on Matthew.*

2. This first period of the text was succeeded by a very different one, which began with the middle of the third century. About that time a limit was put to the licentiousness which had prevailed. The call for a revision was so urgent, that three men undertook the task in different countries almost contemporaneously.

Hesychius in Egypt attempted an amendment of the text. Lucian in Syria made another recension which spread from Syria over Asia Minor, passed the Bosphorus and became current in Thrace and at Byzantium.

Origen's emendation obtained in Palestine.

The Hesychian appears in B. C. L. of the gospels; A. B. C. 17, 46, of the epistles; in the Memphitic version, the writings of Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, the monks Marcus and Macarius, and Cosmas Indicopleustes.

The Lucian recension also called the Constantinopolitan appears in E. F. G. H. S. V. b. h. of the gospels; G. of Paul's epistles, and almost all the Moscow MSS. of Matthaei. The Slavonian and Gothic versions belong to it.

The Origenian recension is contained in A. K. M. 42, 106,

* Meletemata i. and ii. in Commentarius Criticus, part ii.

114, 116, 10 of Matthaei in the gospels, in the Philoxenian Syriac, the writings of Theodoret and Chrysostom.*

Griesbach made some valid objections to parts of this system, to which others have been added by Scholz, Rinck, Tischendorf, De Wette, &c.

The Hesychian recension does not rest on a good historical basis. It seems to have had a very limited circulation even in the country where it was made. After subtracting the passages quoted by Hug which refer to the Septuagint, there are but one in Jerome and one in Pope Gelasius, which speak of the emendation of the New Testament made by Hesychius, and these are unfavourable to the idea of its wide extension.

The passages are these:—"I omit the codices named after Lucian and Hesychius which the perverse contentiousness of a few persons upholds. These critics could not amend anything in the whole Old Testament after the Septuagint, nor did it avail them to do so in the New; since Scripture formerly translated into the languages of many nations shews that their additions are false."†

Again, in the decrees of a council held under Pope Gelasius A.D. 494, it is declared that "the gospels which Lucian and Hesychius falsified are apocryphal."‡

Surely this language is unfavourable to the idea of an extensively adopted revision of the New Testament made by Hesychius in Egypt. It implies that what he *added to* the text was false, which is not like a reviser but an *interpolator*.

* See Hug's Einleit. vol. i. p. 168, et seq.

† "Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in toto Veteri Instrumento post LXX interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendasse: quum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat false esse quae addita sunt." Praefat. in quatuor Evang. ad Damasum.

‡ "Evangelia, quae falsavit Lucianus et Hesychius apocrypha." Decret. P. I. distinct. 15, § 27.

Besides there is no good ground for the suspicion that such additions were made to the text of the copies derived by Hug from Hesychius and Lucian. The suspicion does not fall on them, but rather on D. E. F. G. The fruits of Hesychius's labours must have been small, by no means amounting to a *recension* of the text, nor is it likely that they have continued down till the present time. And then that form of the text ascribed to him appears to be in reality older, since Origen and even Clement exhibit the Alexandrine recension.

Besides, the principal MSS. of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, viz. D. the Laudian E., and the Clermont D., are stichometrically arranged; whereas the stichometrical division was first adopted or invented by Euthalius at Alexandria soon after the middle of the fifth century. Hence the revision of Hesychius did not supersede the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις even at Alexandria.

The recension of Lucian likewise wants a historical basis, as may be seen from the preceding testimonies. It does not appear to have had any general influence, but was confined to a narrow circle of usage. Jerome's testimony is against the view of it taken by Hug, for he says, "Lucian laboured so much in the study of the Scriptures, that even to this day some copies of the Scriptures are called Lucianic."*

Again, it is improbable that Origen undertook to amend the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. The passages on which Hug builds are in Jerome's commentaries on Matthew and Galatians. "In some Latin copies it is added, *neque filius;* whereas in the Greek ones, and especially those of Adamantius and Pierius, this clause is not written."†

* "Lucianus . . . . . tantum in Scripturarum studio laboravit ut usque nunc *quaedam exemplaria* Scripturarum nuncupentur."—De viris illustr. c. 77.

† "In quibusdam Latinis codicibus additum est: *neque filius;* quum in Graecis, et maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus, hoc non habeatur adscriptum."—Praefat. ad. Matth. xxiv. 36.

"We have omitted this because not found in the copies of Adamantius."*

Here "the copies of Origen" mean no more than some which he had used and sanctioned, and were therefore valuable. Origen himself employs words implying that he did not make a revision of the copies of the New Testament.† He was now old, worn out with his previous labours and the persecutions he was exposed to. Hence it is extremely improbable that he did anything more than make a few corrections in some copies which he used. The MSS. of the Origenian recension are according to Hug, A. K. M. 42, 106, 114, 116, Mosc. 10, whose text however was not employed by Origen himself in his writings. There is no peculiarity in the readings of these documents to constitute a recension, or at least there is too little to do so. They agree almost always with D. or with B. L. or with the oriental (Alexandrine) class, as Griesbach has observed.

Thus the system of recensions proposed by this eminent critic has not sufficient authority to commend it to general approbation. It rests on slender grounds which history does not sustain.

Eichhorn's recension-system was *substantially* the same as Hug's. He assumes the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις or unrevised disordered state of the text, in the second and till the middle of the third century. This κοινὴ ἔκδοσις prevailed throughout Christendom, the only difference between Asiatic, Egyptian, and Grecian MSS. being that the first had suffered fewer arbitrary alterations than the last two, because the Greek language was not so well understood by the ecclesiastics and copyists of Asia as in Egypt and Greece.

* "Hoc quia in exemplaribus Adamantii non habetur, omisimus."—Ad Galat. iii. 1.

† "In exemplaribus autem N. T. hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi."—Tom. xv. in Matth. vol. iii. 671.

After the middle of the third century Hesychius and Lucian made recensions of the text—the former revising it as it was current in Egypt, the latter doing the same to it as existing in Asia from Syria to Constantinople. From this onward there were three states of the text different from one another. (1.) The African or Alexandrine. (2.) The Asiatic or Constantinopolitan. (3.) One compounded of both.

To the first belong the readings placed by Thomas of Harkel in the margin of the Philoxenian version, the Jerusalem-Syriac version, the Memphitic, the Sahidic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian. Of MSS. A. B. C. D. L. &c. &c. in the gospels; A. B. C. E. in the Acts; A. B. C. D. H. &c. in the Pauline epistles. To the *Asiatic* belong the Gothic and Slavonic versions; the MSS. E. F. G. H. M. S. in the gospels; 63, 67, &c. in the Acts; 1, 63, 67, &c. in the Pauline epistles. Various causes enumerated by Eichhorn contributed to introduce alterations into the Hesychian and Lucianic texts. The biblical text continued thus till the seventh century, after which no more critical labours were bestowed on it till after the invention of printing. Eichhorn differs from Hug in denying the existence of an Origenian recension.*

The same objections lie against parts of this system as have been stated against similar parts of Hug's. Too much importance is attached to the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian. They were by no means of the extent here assigned to them.

According to Michaelis four principal *editions* have existed.

1. The Western, to which belong the Latin version and the quotations of the Latin fathers, including those who lived in Africa.

2. The Alexandrine or Egyptian edition. With this coincide the quotations of Origen and the Coptic (Memphitic) version.

* Einleit. in das Neue Testament, vol. iv. p. 278, et seq.

3. The Edessene edition, comprehending the MSS. from which the old Syriac version was made.

All these three editions harmonise very frequently with one another.

4. The Byzantine edition. Almost all the Moscow MSS. belong to this or rather to the later Byzantine edition, the quotations of Chrysostom and Theophylact, and the Slavonic version.*

Many objections lie against this classification. It is one of the most improbable that has been proposed. Although it is obviously meant to be an improvement on Griesbach's, it cannot be so regarded. Most of the remarks made in opposition to the latter will apply to Michaelis's.

The system of Nolan consists of three recensions—the Egyptian, the Palestine, and the Byzantine. Latin versions, or rather varieties of the Latin version, were made from MSS. belonging to each of the three. That contained in the Brescian MS. is the most ancient. But the text of the Brescian MS. agrees with the Byzantine, and as the most ancient of the three texts should prevail over the other two, the Byzantine text is the most faithful representative of the primitive one. The Egyptian text was imported by Eusebius of Vercelli into the west, and is represented by the Vercelli MS. of the Latin version; while the Palestine was republished by Euthalius at Alexandria, and has the Vulgate of Jerome corresponding to it.†

Here an antiquity is ascribed to the Latin version *as it exists in the Brescian MS.* which does not belong to it. The cod. Brixianus belongs to the Itala, *i.e.* it is one of those copies of the old Latin which were revised after Greek MSS. and circulated in northern Italy. The cod. Brixianus itself is scarcely

* Introduction to the New Testament by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 175, et seq.

† Inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate or received text of the New Testament.

older than the sixth century, while the cod. Vercellensis belongs to the fourth. There is no good reason for making the condition of the text represented by the former *older* than that in the latter. The reverse is the fact. The cod. Vercellensis contains the old Latin *unrevised*, and since it was made in the second century the basis of the text is very ancient. But the cod. Brixianus contains the *Italic revision* of the same old Latin or *vetus*. In it is found the old Latin revised after MSS. which were then coming into use in northern Italy—later and worse Greek MSS. than those from which the version itself was originally made—MSS. of the (so-called) Constantinopolitan cast with which the Gothic version generally accords. Hence it will be seen that the importance attached by Nolan to the cod. Brixianus, and the resemblance of its text to the Constantinopolitan recension appear in a most fallacious form in his system. The system itself is therefore untenable.

Scholz proposed a system very different from those of Hug and Griesbach.

He finds two recensions, the Constantinopolitan and the Alexandrine. In this way the western and Alexandrine families of Griesbach are grouped together under the one head *Alexandrine*. To the former belong almost all the MSS. made in the last eight centuries, the Philoxenian, Gothic, Georgian, and Slavonic versions, as also almost all the fathers and ecclesiastical writers inhabiting Asia and the eastern part of Europe. To the latter class belong most of the uncial MSS. and a few later ones, most of the versions (Memphitic, Latin, Ethiopic) and fathers which belonged to Africa and the west of Europe. The Constantinopolitan recension represents the original text diffused in Asia Minor, Syria, and Greece; the Alexandrine was the result of the carelessness and caprice of Egyptian grammarians who vitiated the text during the first three centuries, or did not preserve it pure.*

* See Prolegomena in N. T. vol. i. capita i. and ix.

This system is no more free from objection than its predecessors. The ablest opponent it met with was Tischendorf, who undertook to examine the arguments of Scholz at considerable length, and with much effect.* The great objection to it is the assumed fact of the later Constantinopolitan MSS. having faithfully preserved the primitive text which circulated in Asia Minor and Syria. Eusebius has related a fact which goes to prove that the Constantinopolitan copies were not free from the influence of the Alexandrine. At the request of Constantine he made out fifty copies of the New Testament for the use of the churches at Constantinople;† and as we know that he gave a decided preference to Alexandrine documents, there is little doubt that he followed such as Origen had sanctioned. Eusebius therefore had not the same opinion of the Alexandrine MSS. as Scholz. It is true that Scholz endeavours to reply to this fact, but in a very unsatisfactory method.

Rinck divides all MSS. into two classes, *occidental* and *oriental*. To the former belong the uncial copies A. B. C. D. E. F. G.; to the latter almost all the cursive ones. To the former belong the African and Latin fathers and interpreters. This twofold variety already existed in the fifth century and was known to the learned, so that Euthalius in the year 462 compared the Alexandrine text with an exemplar written by Pamphilus.

To the former class belong subdivisions or families. Thus from the western source flowed two streams, the African in A. B. C., with which the Egyptian fathers and interpreters agree; and the Latin in D. E. F. G., which harmonise with the old Latin and the Latin fathers. Some MSS. are of a mixed character which flowed together from the oriental class and the

* See the Prolegomena to his Leipzig edition of the Greek Testament (1841) p. xxx. et seq. † De Vita Constant. Mag. iv. cap. 36.

African family. Of this sort are in the Acts and catholic epistles 15, 18, 25, 36, 40; Moscow d.; and in the Pauline epistles 17, 31, 37, 39, 46, 47, 67. According to this critic the western class is for the most part the fruit of arbitrary correction and licentiousness. Into the oriental class, on the other hand, errors mostly crept through ignorance.*

Tischendorf's view, as proposed in the first edition of his Greek Testament published in 1841, was very like Rinck's. In the second edition it also approaches very near to the same critic's. We shall state his latest sentiments, as contained in the new edition. He specifies four classes, Alexandrine and Latin, Asiatic and Byzantine, wishing them however to be taken in pairs, not singly. There are then two pairs of classes. The Alexandrine was that which prevailed among the Jewish christians of the east, whose Greek diction depended chiefly on the Septuagint. The Latin was among the Latins, whether they employed the Latin or Greek language. The Asiatic prevailed chiefly among the Greeks, whether throughout Asia or in their own country. The Byzantine was spread through the Byzantine church, and gradually brought into a certain uniform state. Hence it is easy to see how it happened that Byzantine copies received the Asiatic method or that of the Greeks. The Alexandrine and the Latin were also conjoined in some degree. The Alexandrine documents are placed by him in the first rank as being the most ancient, while the Byzantine are placed lowest, as they present a text made up by multifarious admixture from more ancient classes.

But while learned men were concocting recensions, others rejected them all as untenable, improbable, and useless. This was the case with Matthaei, who unceremoniously cast aside

* Lucubratio Critica in Acta Apostolorum, epistolas catholicas et Paulinas, p. 2, et seq.

the idea which prompted Griesbach and others to classify their materials of criticism.* Professor Lee in like manner uses strong language of similar import.† Nor are Mr. Penn's words less dogmatical and decided. "The diversities," says he, "resulting from all these causes gradually but continually multiplying through several ages of transcription, in different and distant countries, produced at length texts characteristically differing from each other, and from the most ancient surviving text; and the innate propensity of the mind to clear its notions by endeavouring to reduce its confused ideas to systematical arrangement, prompted some late learned critics to persuade themselves that they had discovered in the chaos of various readings certain fixed marks or tokens by which they could be reduced into true *classes* or *orders*.‡

With the language of these scholars we do not wholly sympathise. We are not yet prepared to set aside the whole matter as an ingenious riddle. Though several attempts to erect recension-systems have not been satisfactory, we need not therefore look upon *all* such endeavours as airy and unsubstantial, or as terminating merely in fine-spun theories and webs of gossamer. Intricacy and obscurity must rest on the subject. It may be difficult to disentangle classes of documents from one another. Averse to subtility and minuteness, some scholars will make this their natural aversion an easy transition to the sentiment that the whole is futile. But in an undertaking so important as the establishment of a pure text, it facilitates the labour of a critic to classify MSS., versions, and citations, so that he may be helped in deciding on the

* Ueber die sogenannten Recensionem welche der Herr Abt. Bengel, der Herr Doctor Semler und der Herr Geheime Kirchenrath Griesbach in dem griechischen Texte des N. Testaments wollen entdeckt haben, 1804.

† Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora, p. 69.

‡ Annotations to the book of the New Covenant, Preface, p. 37.

claims of a particular reading. In the formation of a standard text it may be of some use to lay such a foundation. Hence we do not feel ourselves justified in rejecting at once the whole system of classification as visionary. With all the conjectures which have been indulged in, and the intricacies of the subject, it must not be rudely dismissed. It may be that historical facts are scarcely sufficient to furnish data for any system of recensions properly so called. It may be that conjectures have been put forth too liberally regarding revisions of the text in early times, and the nature of the text itself. It may be that the speculations of German critics have taken too wide a scope, agreeably to the natural tendency of the nation's mind. It is quite true that there is a vagueness and an indefiniteness about the topic which excite rather than gratify a curiosity to know it thoroughly. We admit that it is difficult for the framers of the recension-system itself to distinguish the class to which a particular reading belongs. The characteristics of the text belonging to a document may be almost equally divided between two classes. Or, they may be indistinctly indicated, so that it is very difficult to discover the recension with which it should be associated. The marks of its relationship may be defined so obscurely as to make the question of determining its appropriate class a delicate one. It is also freely admitted that no one document exhibits a recension in its pure or primitive state; but that each form of the text is now more or less corrupted. Still however, with all these drawbacks, the whole system of classification need not be abandoned as visionary. Meagre as are the means within our reach of obtaining a good acquaintance with the early treatment of the New Testament text, we need not despair of all success. No system may be historically sustained, because history says little or nothing on the subject; and yet some system may be convenient. We *may* arrive at a well founded classification, without the ability to shew from early history

its probable origin and existence. As long as the existence of certain characteristic readings belonging to various memorials of the text can be perceived, we will not abandon the idea of recensions or families. And we believe that *classes* in the whole mass of materials may be distinguished from one another. Their *number* here is of no moment; their *existence* is all we claim; and few critics will hesitate to admit the latter as a fact, believing that the critical documents of the New Testament text separate themselves by means of characteristic readings into certain classes.

CHAPTER VII.

OBSERVATIONS ON MODES OF CLASSIFYING THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCUMENTS, AND THEIR CRITICAL APPLICATION.

THERE are two points which deserve attention.

First, *the kind* of classification that appears to be the simplest, and best sustained by all the phenomena; secondly, the critical use to be made of the classification adopted.

1. We cannot see that the Alexandrine and the occidental classes are different. The line of distinction drawn between the MSS. said to belong to them is neither wide nor palpable. The quotations of the Alexandrine fathers Clement and Origen did not differ much from those of the western fathers Tertullian and Cyprian. On the contrary, they agreed with the latter more nearly than with those of the later Alexandrine fathers Athanasius and Cyril. Of 226 readings of Origen in Paul's epistles coinciding with western or Alexandrine authority, or with both, 118 are supported by western authority alone, 90 by western and Alexandrine united, and only 18 by Alexandrine alone. Again, Griesbach enumerates 75 joint readings of A. and C. common to Origen, but Laurence only finds 72. But of these 72 there are not more than seven which do not coincide with the Latin version or some western MS. as with A. C. and Origen. The 65 coinciding with the western text are generally in alliance with several versions, fathers, or

MSS., while the seven exceptions which do not coincide with the same text are little more than isolated readings. In the first epistle to the Corinthians there is *an agreement* of all or some documents of the Alexandrine and western recensions in 194 passages, where there is a departure from the oriental or Byzantine. It is also against the existence of an occidental as separate from an Alexandrine class that the Sahidic version belongs to the former, not to the latter. How can such fact be explained on the supposition that there was a real line between the two? For these and other reasons the existence of a western class appears problematical. In truth the Alexandrine alone should be held, for the occidental is not far from being identical with it. Eichhorn is right in saying that the dream of a twofold recension, an Alexandrine and an occidental, has no foundation in history.

In contradistinction to the Alexandrine class of MSS. is the Constantinopolitan, characterised by great uniformity. On the other hand the Alexandrine exhibits very considerable diversities. Whatever be the cause or causes, the readings of the one class are characteristically different from those of the other. Let us first speak of the name assigned to documents bearing resemblances to one another, whether MSS., versions, or quotations.

We object to the name *recension* as liable to convey an erroneous impression. According to Griesbach's notion, it was *properly* applied by him to his Alexandrine class, but *improperly* to his two other classes. According to Hug, it was *properly* applied to the three forms of the text which arose after the middle of the third century. But it can neither be proved nor rendered probable that the diversities existing between what have been called *recensions* were attributable each to one leading person, or that they resulted from a formal revision and correction of the text. There was no *general revision* of the text at any time by any person, in

any country. Nor did such a thing proceed from *a number of persons* acting in concert for the one object. We must dismiss the idea of Origen, Hesychius, Lucian, the grammarians of Alexandria, Eusebius, Euthalius, being each or all the authors of extensive *recensions*. The different forms of the text to which the objectionable name has been given were more the result of chance than design. They were formed gradually and in a great measure imperceptibly. Out of the confluence of single corrections, scholia, glosses, mistakes, arose such conformations of the text. Thus, studied purpose and intention contributed but little to their production. No doubt individual correctors helped occasionally to bring them about. There were persons now and then who were imbued with some critical taste who probably revised one or more copies. But this was only one influence among many, and by itself would have been both insignificant and imperceptible. All the copies in different lands which have been distributed into recensions were as a whole *unrevised*. No one recension had been corrected. A number of documents came by degrees through fortuitous circumstances to present more or fewer cognate readings. The influences to which they had been exposed were various. Country, national habits, intercourse with other peoples, general culture, reputation of particular churches, monasteries, schools, biblical students, these and innumerable other things all conspired to the production of a certain form of text in a certain country, or in a certain wide territory more or less closely associated.

In thus asserting that all the documents are properly *unrevised*, we do not forget that single passages in several of them were revised, and that a few of a mixed character bearing the same impress may be distinguished. If however any recension be selected and looked at as a whole, it will be found to consist of unrevised, uncorrected documents. It has not the marks of design *throughout it*. The nature of

the single copies of which it consists shews that it arose out of a great number of fortuitous concurrent circumstances. Neither do we forget the opinion of Hug that D. E. F. G. represent the old unrevised text, the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις; while the text of A. B. C. is purer, and evidently revised. Such distinction, however, between the two classes of uncial MSS. is futile. The reasons given for it are nugatory. Clement of Alexandria, who according to Hug belonged to the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις period, agrees with some notable readings in D. E. F. G. Hence D. E. F. G. must be exempted from revisal, while the Alexandrine A. B. C. have a purified text. But Clement of Alexandria agrees as much at least, if not more, with A. B. C. as with D. E. F. G. Besides, the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις is not uniformly corrupt. Sometimes it is more than the text of A. B. C., sometimes less so. Single documents of it are more degenerate, others less. Besides there are various passages where D. E. F. G. have the true reading and A. B. C. not. In some places too, A. B. C. have mistakes which did not originate with them but were derived from some other source, while D. E. F. G. contain *primary* errors. In fact, there is no good reason for exempting D. E. F. G. from the influence of the early critics any more than A. B. C. They may have come under the hands of less intelligent, skilful, adventurous critics than the latter. The *degree* of revision they underwent was less. But that is a very different thing from the representation given by Hug, which proceeds on a wrong assumption. We cannot believe that the edition of D. is the basis of the edition in B. C. L. It cannot be shewn that it is so. On the contrary, sometimes that of the one, sometimes that of the other is the later transmitted form. And if D. presented the most ancient state of the text, it would present *the truer* state, which it does not. Wherever there is an abundance of good readings, *there* is the more ancient text. But D. is much more interpolated than B. C. L.

If these observations be correct, the memorials of the New Testament text should be distributed into *classes*, not recensions.

But here arise a number of perplexing circumstances which throw a degree of vagueness over the subject of classification. The metes and bounds of even two classes are not well defined. No MS., no version, no father whether Greek or Latin, presents that condition of the text which is called *a class*, accurately and constantly. All the documents, even the most ancient ones, present some marks of another class than that to which they belong. This is admitted and pointed out by Griesbach himself, especially in B. and A.

Again, the question comes up how many and what kind of individual readings are required to constitute a class. It is admitted that all the documents of each class are more or less impure and mixed together in their readings: of how many then is the class to consist, and what is the test for including an individual document in a class? There is no doubt that *country* has been made an important particular in separating classes; but country itself may be overbalanced by other circumstances, and is in every case modified by a variety of influences.

Another question which perplexes the critic is, in what does *the genius* of each class adopted consist? What are the respective natures of two classes, if that number be fixed on?

It is also true that a great number of the various readings that have been collected have had their origin in accidental circumstances. They are trifling mistakes, consisting in negligences, or imperfections of sight and hearing, slips of the pen, omissions, changes, transpositions of letters, syllables, words, and cognate clauses. Of what avail, it may be asked, are such trifling things in determining distinct classes? Are they not fortuitous variations; and how can such avail to the ascertainment of *a class?*

If, on the other hand, such various readings as originated in *design* be taken in order to shape out a class of documents, it is by no means easy to distribute the immense multitude of readings according to their origin in *intention* and in *accident*. Many that owed their *existence* to design were propagated *unintentionally*. Thus a gloss was put at first into the margin of a copy. But a transcriber, through mere mistake, afterwards put it into the text.

The circumstances now stated are embarrassing to the critic. They shew how many considerations should be taken into account in any attempt to distribute the New Testament documents into classes, and favour the idea of adopting the simplest division possible. We believe that they recommend a division of all the critical materials into two classes as the freest from difficulty and the most easily apprehended.

The proposed plan does not aim at niceness of distinction, neither does it demand a power of minute discrimination. It draws a tolerably plain line, which is all the better, as the subject is inexact by its very nature, and abhorrent of palpable presentation. It cannot be so bounded and fixed as to preclude considerable latitude. After all, something depends on the subjective notions of the critic respecting the proper *extent* of a class whether the number should be limited to two, or whether it ought to be increased. Some may put as a sub-class or family what others would not hesitate to exalt into a proper class. There may be advantages in enlarging the number of classes as far as probability will warrant. Griesbach himself admits the propriety of an extended division; for he supposes the existence of *five* or *six* classes, in his *Curae in epistolas Paulinas*.* But the advantages arising from an increase of classes, are counterbalanced by serious inconveniences. *Utility in practical application* is on the side of as few as possible. And as *the critical system* to which a classification leads depends

* Opuscula Academica, vol. ii. p. 49.

on the classification itself, the simpler must be preferred. A complex *classification* will not readily admit of a simple *application.*

Assuming then the existence of two classes, an eastern and western, how shall each be characterised? To what kind of errors does each incline? In the eastern the mistakes of the text arose for the most part from ignorance and such oversights as are usual and indeed unavoidable in propagating documents by copies from one generation to another. The mistakes necessarily multiply with the multiplication of copies, so that the latest written documents contain the most blunders. But in the western, the variations seem to be the result of caprice and a taste for correcting. The transcribers of the former class were less intelligent than those of the latter. The occidental copyists and possessors of MSS. were not scrupulous about their treatment of the text. They handled it freely. They added, omitted, introduced glosses, changed synonymous expressions, transposed others. On the other hand, the oriental copyists and possessors of MSS. made mistakes from imperfect sight, from ὁμοιοτέλευτον, from abbreviations, from being misled by glosses or scholia. In their case there was more negligence; in the case of the others more license and caprice.

These remarks will perhaps account in part for the fact, that the one class is characterised by considerable diversities of text, the other by much more uniformity. There was no general revision in either case; but in the occidental class there was more individual revising, if so it can be termed, than in the oriental. But as these individuals were guided by no principle, and corrected according to no uniform method, as they had little reverence for the mere words of the text, they proceeded very much *subjectively.* They were *presumptuous* rather than *careless* transcribers. This was especially the case at Alexandria, where grammarians and learned men abounded.

To the western class belong the MSS. B. D. L. in the

gospels; in the epistles A. B. C. D. E. F. G. the Alexandrine, Carthaginian and Latin fathers and interpreters.

To the eastern belong the cursive MSS. generally, with the fathers and versions belonging to the east.

Certain documents are of a mixed character, such as A. C. K. M. in the gospels. The Peshito Syriac, if what is said of it by Hug and Griesbach be correct, cannot well belong to either class. The same applies to the Jerusalem Syriac, whose text is both ancient and valuable.

This twofold variety of documents may be exemplified thus:—

In 1 Corinth. iii. 4 we have both readings, *οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε* and *οὐκ* or *οὐχὶ σαρκικοί ἐστε*. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. as also 17, 67, a secunda manu, 71, and Joh. Damascenus, Origen, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, the Memphitic, Æthiopic, Vetus, Vulgate, read *ἄνθρωποι*. In this the common origin of those uncial MSS. is seen, for the copy whence they were derived, doubtless through intermediate transcripts, had the scholium *ἄνθρωποι* above *σαρκικοί*, which gave rise to the taking of *ἄνθρωποι instead of σαρκικοί* into the text. The same uncial MSS. agree in omitting with a *very* few cursive ones the words in the epistle to the Romans xiv. 6 from *καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν . . . . . φρονεῖ*. This is an example of *ὁμοιοτέλευτον*. They also agree in omitting *ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς* in epistle to Romans xv. 24, and in the omission of *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ* in Romans xv. 29. In 1 Corinth. x. 1, A. B. C. D. E. F. G. have *γάρ*, whereas the oriental class of MSS. with the Peshito have *δέ*, which the context appears to require. In 1 Corinth. xi. 11, the uncial MSS. generally have *οὔτε γυνὴ χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς, οὔτε ἀνὴρ χωρὶς γυναικός*. But the oriental class with the Peshito and Vulgate read *πλὴν οὔτε ἀνὴρ χωρὶς γυναικὸς, οὔτε γυνὴ χωρὶς ἀνδρός*.

From these and many other like examples we may fairly assume a relationship between these leading uncial MSS. A. B. C. D. E. F. G.

Again, all the cursive MSS. with a very few exceptions, read Ἀχαΐας in place of Ἀσίας, Romans xvi. 5. They also put Romans xvi. 25-27 at the end of the fourteenth chapter. In like manner, the same documents, with five exceptions which harmonise with the uncials, add the words καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν, ἅτινά ἐξι τοῦ θεοῦ to 1 Corinth. vi. 20, which were at first a marginal gloss. So too with a few exceptions they have ὀφειλομενην εὔνοιαν (a gloss) in place of ὀφειλὴν, 1 Corinth. vii. 3; σχολάζητε for σχολάσητε, 1 Corinth. vii. 5; where they also add τῇ νηςείᾳ καί, and admit the gloss συνέρχεσθε for ἦτε.

This twofold variety of copies already existed and *was recognised* in the fifth century, for Euthalius (A.D. 462) compared the Alexandrine text with a MS. copy of Pamphilus at Caesarea, as he himself states. This is corroborated by the fact that 46 (Pauline ep.) of Griesbach, and 109 Acts and epistles, which are transcripts of the Euthalian copy, occupy an intermediate place between the occidental and oriental classes, agreeing sometimes with the uncial, at other times with the cursive MSS.

The origin of the two classes cannot be historically traced to single persons or places, or to definite times, else there would not have been a total silence in antiquity respecting such particulars. They arose and were formed *gradually*.

If these observations be just, they will serve to shew the vain endeavours of the followers of Hug to prove that about the commencement of the fourth century three forms of a revised text came into general use—one in the churches of Egypt, called the Egyptian or Alexandrine; another in Greece, Thrace, Asia, Syria; and another extending as far as the four gospels only. The attempted proof miserably fails. That there were three recensions of the text at this time, is an assumption resting on no good foundation. Hug's forms of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις in different countries, and then the revised forms of it in the same and perhaps other districts, are for the most part imagi-

nary. Even Jerome has been pressed into the service of a theory like Hug's. Because he writes that in preparing a revised edition of the Latin version, "this present preface promises only the four gospels of which the order is, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, amended from the collation of Greek copies but ancient ones; and lest the gospels should differ much from the usage of the Latin text, I have used the pen with restraint, so that while correcting the things only which appeared to alter the sense, I allowed others to remain as they had been."* It will surprise the reader to learn the fact of which this is said to be *a proof*, viz. that a revision or recension of the original had been introduced, supposed to be more critically correct, and which had on that account superseded the old uncritical copies formerly in circulation. But how is this strange conclusion deduced? In the strangest possible way. Jerome went back for ancient MSS. to amend the text of the Latin, not because they were better than the more recent ones, *but because they were worse.* The recent ones being more correct because they had been revised, were not easily adapted to his purpose. The Latin translation could not be readily accommodated to the better MSS. then in circulation. He resorted to the old unrevised copies which had been laid aside because they differed less from the Latin version than the critically revised ones. Surely this is most perverse and strange reasoning. Jerome must have been very silly to write to Damasus, if this were his meaning, and innocently declare what he had done. Doubtless he went back to the ancient codices, because he thought their text better. Besides, he says

* "Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quatuor evangelia; codicum graecorum *emendata* collatione, sed *veterum*, quae ne multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum, quae sensum videbantur mutare correctis, reliqua manere pateremur, ut fuerant."—Praefat in Evang. ad Damasum.

that he sometimes consulted the codices of *Origen*, manifestly because they were good.

Neither can any induction founded on the phenomena of the oldest existing MSS. prove that about this time three forms of revised text had come into general use among Christians. Let any one examine the documents of the fifth century, compare previously made versions with them, trace their influence as far as it can be discerned in transcripts, and it is impossible for him to make out such recensions to the satisfaction of those who know what the term means, or ought to mean if rightly used. Here Hug has indulged his imagination to a large extent; nor has Griesbach, in various concessions which he made in his old age to the new theory of Hug, perceived the untenable propositions which the ingenuity of his younger fellow-labourer had set forth in a plausible dress.

We have seen that two classes existed in the time of Euthalius, and were recognised at that time by the learned. Neither *two*, nor *three*, nor *four recensions* were current. The classes did not originate by means of critical revisions conducted on certain principles. There had always been scribes and correctors of the text wherever copies circulated; but what they did was so inconsiderable as to leave the general mass of codices much as they were before, till the multiplication of transcripts and the various treatment to which the text was exposed, with the increasing number of critics, led by degrees to the appearance of certain general features among the documents. Such scribes and correctors existed in the second, third, and fourth centuries, in varying numbers and with various habits in different countries. During these early times it is thought that they took very considerable liberties with the text, especially at Alexandria. Griesbach thinks that the licentiousness of transcribers in regard to the text ceased very much from the fifth century among the Greeks, and among

the Latins somewhat later. Doctrinal controversies had arisen, many commentaries on Scripture had been written, the Catholic fathers insisted more on the words of the text when they wished to confound heretics or to instruct their disciples in the faith. Besides, the churches came to be more closely united, and to have frequent intercourse with each other. They communicated copies of the sacred Scriptures to one another, and adopted a fixed edition of the text from which they did not venture to depart. And the monks especially were most diligent in transcribing the sacred books with exemplary accuracy and patience. Their very superstition kept them from meddling freely with the text.

But though the occidental and Alexandrine of Griesbach constitute but one class, yet this may admit of subdivision. There are two subdivisions or families in it, viz. the African and the Latin. To the former belong B. L. in the gospels; to the latter D. with the Egyptian fathers and interpreters; in the Acts and epistles A. B. C. belong to the African; D. E. F. G. to the Latin.

Agreeably to this classification and subdivision, Rinck found that in the ninth chapter of John's gospel B. D. L. (or B. D. or D. L.) differed from the mass of MSS. in thirty-three cases, having the African and Latin interpreters consenting; while B. L. without D. agreed in nine places against the oriental class. Thus B. L. had more agreement with D. against the oriental class, than disagreement with D. *and* the oriental class. When the African and Latin families vary, the former evinces an inclination for greater elegance of style and for avoiding Hebraisms, agreeably to Griesbach's sententious statement, "*grammaticum* egit Alexandrinus censor, *interpretem* occidentalis," *i.e.* the Latin family.

2. The critical use to be made of classification.

The use which Griesbach made of his recensions is well known. He laid down certain rules respecting them. But he

did not consistently apply them. He departed less from the received text than he should have done by his own critical system. In not a few cases, notwithstanding his own principles, and in opposition to them, he allowed *the internal goodness* of a reading a superior influence. Hence his text exhibits better readings than his recension system would have properly recommended. But yet he gave too much scope to his system of recensions in the determination of his text. It became too mechanical. And in the hands of some of his admirers it assumed this character to a very injurious extent. Griesbach's ingenuity and critical tact prevented him from a mechanical mode of procedure, which others possessed of less subjective ability incautiously adopted. On the whole, it cannot be said that Griesbach's recension-system led him easily, naturally, and consistently to the determination of a right text. Probably it could not be consistently and successfully applied to any great extent. The differences between the text of the second edition and the text of the minor Leipzig edition confirm the truth of this remark.

If again we look at Scholz's application of *his* classification, the same observations will hold good. He has not consistently and uniformly adhered to his own principles. He has frequently departed from them, especially in the second volume, and that too for the better.

We believe that no mode of classification can be of much utility to the critic in ascertaining the right reading. Here the entire theory is worthless to a considerable extent. So many conditions and limitations must be taken along with any classification however good, that the influence of itself ceases to be much recognised.

As to the western and eastern classes, opinions have differed respecting their comparative value. According to some the authority of the junior MSS. decidedly preponderates over the older ones, or in other words the Constantinopolitan over the

Alexandrine. There are others again who greatly prefer the Alexandrine, giving them a decided weight above the Constantinopolitan. To the former party belongs Matthaei, who abused the Alexandrine MSS. and their admirers. Their peculiar readings were "Origen's spittle" which those who pleased might lick. They were "dunghill MSS.," through the fumes of which poor Griesbach had lost the use of his eyes. Such language disgraced the person who stooped to its use.

Another advocate of the Constantinopolitan text was Nolan, who vindicated it however, because he thought it the most ancient! His proof of its great antiquity, we need scarcely say, is a complete failure. Nothing can be more perverse than his style of argument.

Another admirer of the Constantinopolitan MSS. is Scholz. It is strange however that he has not always followed them in his text. Notwithstanding his excessive partiality for them, he has inserted not a few Alexandrine readings.

To the latter party belong Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Penn.

Others again, in determining the value of readings are influenced not so much by the fact of their being found in a more ancient or a modern family, but by their *internal goodness*. They do not think that because they are in the Alexandrine family they are ancient on that account solely; or because they exist in the Constantinopolitan family they are therefore modern; but they determine the value by internal goodness aided by antiquity, and allow that an ancient reading may be found in a copy comparatively modern. Hence they do not at once prefer either an Alexandrine or a Constantinopolitan reading, simply on account of the class to which it belongs.

We do not agree with the sentiments of the first party. *Ceteris paribus*, the reading of an ancient copy is more likely to be authentic than that of a modern one. But the reading of a

more modern copy may be more ancient than the reading of an ancient one. A modern copy itself may have been derived not from an extant one more ancient, but from one still more ancient no longer in existence. And this was probably the case in not a few instances. If indeed the oldest MSS. extant were *fair* and *correct* transcripts of others still older now lost, the nature of the case would be different. But that is sometimes questionable. The texts of old extant MSS. bear traces of revision by arbitrary and injudicious critics.

As it has been too much the fashion to decry the oriental class of MSS. because they are junior, let us see how far they deserve the inferiority and neglect to which some consign them. Griesbach found that as often as his Alexandrine and Western recensions coincided in their readings in the epistle to the Romans and the first to the Corinthians, 58 readings were certain, 64 probable, 41 not improbable. Thus 163 were more or less weighty and valuable. On the contrary, 11 were manifestly bad, 20 improbable, and 25 scarcely probable. Thus 56 were without the appearance of being true. Here some allowance should be made for Griesbach's opinion of the western class, which was too high. Let us compare with this estimate the oriental class. Over against 56 readings in the western class (made up of the Alexandrine and western recensions) more or less devoid of the appearance of being true, let us put as many certain ones in the oriental class; opposite to the 41 not improbable of the western, let us put as many probable of the eastern; over against the 64 probable of the western let as many be placed not improbable of the eastern; and thus there will be 161 readings of the eastern class of greater or less value, and only 58 either plainly false, or improbable, or scarcely probable. Hence by this computation the number of inferior readings in both is about equal.

In like manner Rinck found* that out of A. B. C. D. E. F.

* Lucubratio Critica, p. 13.

G., where, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, they agreed in opposition to all or most of the cursive MSS. (with the occasional exception of E.) 32 readings should be adopted, 46 rejected. He also found that in almost all the uncial MSS. only 13 readings, in the same epistle, not in the Oriental class are to be preferred, and 103 to be rejected. Griesbach himself has admitted out of all the uncials in this portion but 37 readings, rejecting 41. Surely then these conclusions will moderate the views of such as lay undue stress on the western class because it consists of the oldest MSS., and depreciate the oriental because almost all its MSS. are junior ones. They shew that though there may have been more critical handling of copies in the west, there was probably corruption too; that in Italy, Gaul, and Africa, the text was subjected to greater innovations than in the east. The circumstance mentioned by Scholz that it is chiefly Alexandrine and western writers who speak of the deterioration of the Scriptures, while we scarcely hear of an author belonging to Asia and Constantinople making the same complaint, is not without force.

It should also be observed that the readings of A. in the epistles of Paul agree much more with those of the Byzantine text which is in our junior codices, than with those found in the old MSS. representing the western or Alexandrine text.*

But it must not be supposed that we sympathise in the sentiments of such critics as Scholz and Matthaei, who unduly exalt the Constantinopolitan above the Alexandrine.

A more recent and popular classification of MSS. is into *ancient* and *more recent*. Bentley was the first person who proposed to edit the Greek Testament from ancient MSS., rejecting the evidence of modern ones. The same idea was afterwards applied by Lachmann, but not fully, nor exactly in the way that Bentley intended. Tischendorf has followed the

* See Laurence on Griesbach's classification of Greek MSS. p. 49, et seq.

same classification, but without restricting it in the manner Lachmann does; and it is also approved by Tregelles. In drawing the line between ancient and modern MSS. different critics will necessarily have different sentiments.

But here again it is obvious that many modifications must be taken into account by such as take a text from the ancient documents alone. Lachmann has acted too mechanically. As he has not regarded the internal goodness of readings, which indeed he did not profess to do, he has not produced a critical text. He has merely given the text of a certain class of documents. Tischendorf, whose purpose was to give a critical edition containing as pure a text as possible, has succeeded better than any other who follows the new classification. That he has entirely succeeded is more than he himself would claim. Had he taken a wider range of authorities, and spent more time over his edition, he would have made it much better.

What then, it may be asked, has been the result of classification-theories? Have the time and labour spent upon them been all in vain? The principal good resulting from them has been the examination and description of many documents which might otherwise have been neglected at the time. The collations made by the ingenious framers of recensions and classes have been valuable. But we are unable to see their other benefits. Divide the documents as we may, either into eastern and western, or ancient and more recent, the scale in favour of a particular reading as probably the original one, is seldom turned by the orientalism and occidentalism of the testimonies, or even by their ancient and modern character. The *ceteris paribus* cases, where such things would at once settle the question, scarcely occur. *External* is but one part of the evidence. The *internal* is equally valuable and important. It modifies, changes, outweighs the other in many examples. We are thankful to the collators of MSS. for their great

labour. But it may be doubted whether they be often competent to make the best critical text out of existing materials. They are too prone to give undue authority to external evidence. Here lies their temptation; their weak point is here. It is true that critical sagacity may be united with unwearied diligence and accuracy of collation. But it is not commonly so. And then it is sufficient for one man to *collate well* several important documents, whether they be versions, MSS., or patristic citations. It exhausts his patience and energy. Hence we should rather see the collator and the editor of the text dissociated. We should like to have one person for each department.

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF THE PRINTED TEXT.

The Greek Testament was not printed so early as the Vulgate or the Hebrew Bible, because the influence of the Romish church was opposed to the circulation of the original text.

The first part of the Greek Testament which was printed consisted of the thanksgiving hymns of Mary and Zacharias, Luke i. 42-56, 68-80, appended to a Greek Psalter published in 1486. The next consisted of the first six chapters of the gospel by John, edited by Aldus Manutius at Venice, 1504, 4to. In 1512 appeared the entire gospel in Greek and Latin, at Tübingen, 4to.

The entire New Testament was first *printed* in the Complutensian Polyglott, which was prepared under the auspices and at the expense of Cardinal Ximenes. The whole of the work is distributed into six *parts*, making four *volumes*, the *first* part consisting of the Greek Testament and the Vulgate version, with the title prefixed, "Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine nouiter impressum." It is in folio, and a subscription at the end of Revelation gives the date of the completion of the New Testament, 10th January 1514. The sixth and last part ending with the three books of Maccabees, has at the close the date 10th July 1517. But though the printing of

the whole work was finished in 1517, it was not *published* till 1522, because the Pope's permission had not been obtained for the distribution and sale of the work. Of the MSS. used in preparing this edition of the Greek Testament, we have no knowledge, as the editors, Ælius Antonius Nebrissensis, Demetrius Cretensis, Ferdinandus Pintianus, and Lopez de Stunica, give a very imperfect account of them. In the preface it is said that they were sent from the Pope's library at Rome, and no hint is given about others. But Stunica, in his controversy with Erasmus, frequently refers to the *Cod. Rhodiensis* as a MS. which the editors used. It is now the general opinion that they were modern ones. The character of the readings found in the edition is sufficient to shew this. And since almost all the readings are found in six or eight copies collated by Mill, Wetstein, and Birch, the MSS. must have been few in number. Hence the boast of the editors that they had good and very ancient MSS. is vain. On thing is certain, that the celebrated Cod. B. was not one of them. As Ximenes's MSS., according to his biographer, were deposited in the University Library at Alcala, inquiries were made at the place respecting them by Moldenhauer and Tychsen when travelling at the expense of the King of Denmark, in the latter half of the eighteenth century (1784), for the purpose of collating ancient copies of the Bible. But the professors in question were informed that the MSS. had been ignorantly sold to a rocket-maker by an illiterate librarian in 1749. Dr. Bowring subsequently made inquiries and believed that the report was incorrect, the same MSS. being there as those described by the Cardinal's biographer Gomez, and in Bowring's opinion they are both *modern* and *valueless*.* But Bowring's letters are by no means clear or decisive on the subject, for he says that "the number of *Hebrew* MSS. in the University was only

* See the Monthly Repository, vol. xvi. for 1821, p. 203, and New Series, vol. i. for 1827, p. 572.

seven, and seven is the number that now remains." Of these seven he affirms that they are *modern* and *valueless*. His attention therefore was not specially directed to *Greek* MSS. but to Hebrew ones. Indeed he states that there are at Alcala no Greek MSS. of the whole Bible.

Subsequent inquiries made by Dr. James Thomson clear up the matter. All the MSS. formerly known to belong to Cardinal Ximenes and preserved in the library at Alcala, are now, with the rest of that library, at Madrid; and the catalogue made in 1745 correctly describes the MSS. which still exist. The librarian at Madrid communicated to Dr. Thomson a catalogue of the Complutensian MSS., whence it appears that the chief MSS. used in the Polyglott are still preserved in safety; but the Greek New Testament is not contained in any of them. All the MSS. used in the Greek Testament by the editors were furnished from the Vatican, to which they were probably returned. It would appear that none containing the Greek MSS. were ever in the library at Alcala or in the possession of Ximenes, and therefore they are not now in the library at Madrid.

A sale to a rocket-maker *did* take place about the time mentioned. But the librarian was a learned man, and could not have sold *MSS.* Probably he sold only waste and useless paper when he got all the books in the library rebound.*

It was believed by Wetstein and Semler, that the text had been altered by the editors in conformity with the Vulgate. But Goeze, Michaelis, Marsh, and others shewed that the charge was true to *a very limited* extent. There is little doubt that 1 John v. 7 was taken from the Vulgate in consequence of *the form* it appears in; and some other passages were probably adapted to the same version, such as Matt. x. 25; yet there are more than two hundred passages in the Catholic epistles in which the Complutensian

* See Biblical Review for 1847, vol. iii. p. 186, et seq.

Greek text differs from the text of the Vulgate as there printed. Hence the charge generally is incorrect.

The *first published* Greek Testament was that of Erasmus, which appeared at Basel in 1516, folio, printed by the celebrated Froben. The title is, "Novum Instrumentum omne diligenter ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum et emendatum, non solum ad graecam veritatem, verum etiam ad multorum utriusque linguae Codicum, eorumque veterum simul et emendatorum fidem, postremo ad probatissimorum autorum citationem, emendationem et interpretationem, praecipue Origenis, Chrysostomi, Cyrilli, Vulgarij, Hieronymi, Cypriani, Ambrosij, Hilarij, Augustini, una cum annotationibus quae lectorem doceant, quid qua ratione mutatum sit," &c. The work contains the Latin Vulgate as well as the Greek text, together with notes. In the preparation of this edition, Erasmus used five MSS., three chiefly, the other two very cursorily, viz. 2 (of the four gospels), 2 (of the Acts and epistles), and 1 (of the Apocalypse). From 1 (gospels, Acts, and epistles) he improved the text somewhat, but did not make it *the basis* of the text, though it was the oldest and best of all, belonging to the tenth century. He also made use of 4 (Acts and epistles) for retouching the text. Thus he took his text from modern MSS., and those very few, as well as of little value. But the editor did not confine himself wholly to them, nor to the writings of the fathers; for he made some use of the Vulgate, and even of critical conjecture. The only copy of the Revelation he had appears to have wanted the last six verses, which he supplied by his own translation from the Latin. Hence much value cannot belong to the text, especially as the editor spent little time upon the work. It was proposed to him on the 17th April 1515, and the subscription announces that it was finished in February 1516. Truly therefore might Erasmus himself say of it, "praecipitatum fuit verius quam editum;" for *the printing* of the text and annotations could not have occupied

more than six months, and from the time Froben first proposed the edition till the completion of the printing, was only nine months and a half. Hartwell Horne has *improved* upon Mill's words, by saying that "the work was executed in the short space of five months," only by departing farther from the truth; for Mill carefully qualifies his statement by putting *ferme*, "intra menses ferme quinque." It was very unfortunate that Erasmus had but one MS. (1.) of the Apocalypse, which is now lost.

A second edition appeared in 1519 at the same place and by the same printer, in folio. In 1522 appeared the third edition with 1 John v. 7, inserted for the first time, having been taken from the cod. Montfortianus. The fourth edition appeared in 1527; and the fifth in 1535 all in folio, from the same press.

In the second edition he used one MS. at least which he did not consult in the first, viz. 3 in the first part, or the gospels. Mill says * that the text of the second edition is much more accurate than that of the first; that the editor restored the true reading which had been vitiated in the former, in more than 330 places; but departed from the first edition to adopt bad readings in about 70 places.

According to Mill† the third differs from the second in about 118 places, 36 of them being altered after the Aldine edition.

In the fourth edition the Complutensian Polyglott was used by Erasmus for the first time especially in the Revelation. According to Mill,‡ it differs from the third in 106 places, 90 of them relating to the Apocalypse alone. The text of the fifth is so very like that of the fourth, that Mill detected only four places where it departs from its predecessor. §

From these two primary editions the *textus receptus* or *common text* has been mainly derived. But as they were

* Prolegomena, 1134. † Ibid, 1138. ‡ Ibid, 1141. § Ibid, 1150.

based on few materials, and those not of the best kind; as the editors also conformed their texts to the Vulgate in several places, and occasionally translated from the Latin into Greek, their editions cannot be highly valued. And if the main source or sources of *the common text* be of little worth, the stream must be proportionately inferior.

From the Complutensian and Erasmian a great many editions were taken, with slight alterations. The *former* was followed in the first edition of Robert Stephens, termed the *O mirificam* edition, because the preface begins with those words, referring to the extraordinary liberality of Francis I. It was published at Paris 1546, 12mo. Sixteen MSS. were used by the editor. According to Mill,* he departed from the Complutensian, in the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles 581 times; and followed the authority of his codices only 37 times. In other places he preferred to the Complutensian the readings of other editions, especially the fifth of Erasmus, whether his MSS. agreed or not. In the Apocalypse he scarcely ever deviated from Erasmus's text. The second edition appeared at the same place 1549, 12mo. Mill says that it differs from the former in no more than 67 places.† The preface begins in the same manner.

The Plantin editions also followed the Complutensian text. They appeared at Antwerp 1564 12mo, 1573 8vo, 1574 32mo, 1590 8vo: 1591 24mo, by Rapheleng at Leyden, 1601 16mo, also by Rapheleng at Leyden: 1612 32mo, by the same.

A number of Genevan editions also flowed from the same text, 1609 24mo, 1619 4to, 1620 4to, 1628 4to, 1632 24mo.

In like manner the text printed in the Paris Polyglott of Le Jay, ninth and tenth volumes, follows the same exemplar, 1645 folio.

* Prolegomena, 1177. † Ibid, 1120.

So too the edition of Hermann Goldhagen at Mainz 1753 8vo. This is accompanied by various readings, the object of which was to enhance the authority of the Vulgate. The editor belonged to the society of Jesuits.

The *text of Erasmus* was followed in the Aldine edition of Andreas Asulanus, Venice, (Aldus Manutius) 1518 folio. But the text of this very rare edition is *not* a mere reprint of Erasmus's first, as has sometimes been said. Though it is very like it, the Aldine has been amended in more than 100 places, notwithstanding it has been corrupted in as many. The editor appears to have had ancient MSS. though nothing is known of them. Some have thought that he occasionally gave readings from conjecture.

The same text was repeated by N. Gerbelius in an edition dated Hagenoae 1521 4to; by John Bebelius at Basel 1524 8vo, 1531 8vo, 1535 8vo; by Cephalaeus at Strasburgh 1524 8vo, 1534 8vo; by Thomas Platter at Basel 1538 8vo, 1540 8vo, 1543 8vo; by Brylinger at Basel 1533 8vo, 1543 8vo, 1548 8vo, 1549 8vo, 1553 8vo, 1556 8vo, 1558 8vo, 1586 8vo; by John Valder at Basel, 1536 16mo; by Heerwagen at Basel 1545 folio; by Froben and Episcopius at the same place 1545 4to; by Curio at the same place 1545 16mo; at Leipzig 1542 8vo; by Voegel at the same place in 1563, 1564 8vo, 1570 8vo; by Leonhard Osten at Basel 1588; and at Wittenberg by Erasmus Schmid, 1622 4to, 1635 8vo. Among these reprints of the Erasmian text, some are more distinguished than the rest, such as that of Colinaeus published at Paris in 1534 8vo. Here the Erasmian text is altered in many places on the authority of the Complutensian and some Greek MSS. such as Griesbach's 119, 120. The editor has been charged with altering the text from the Vulgate, a conjecture; but several critics have vindicated him from these accusations. In the edition of Paris 1543 8vo, some alterations were made from MSS. Wetstein and others call it

Bogard's edition, but improperly, as Bogard had nothing to do with the publication.

In 1550 appeared Robert Stephens' third edition in folio at Paris. This is called the Regia or royal edition, and is elegantly printed. In it he followed the fifth of Erasmus (with which he compared 65 MSS. marking the variations in the margin), and the Complutensian text. "The learned," says Hug, "have taken great pains to discover the MSS. which Stephens used in his third edition. This solicitude has been occasioned by 1 John v. 7."* They are marked by the Greek letters α, β, γ, δ, ε, ϛ, ζ, η, θ, ι, ια, ιβ, ιγ, ιδ, ιε, ιϛ. Stephens states that he got eight of them from the Royal Library at Paris, viz. γ, δ, ε, ϛ, ζ, η, ι, ιϛ. About the commencement of the last century Le Long tried to identify them with existing MSS., and appeared tolerably successful in the attempt. His observations were published first in the Journal des Sçavans for May 1720, and subsequently in a better form in the Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. i. But Martin expressed doubts as to the identification; and Marsh subjected Le Long's remarks to an acute criticism in his letters to Travis and notes to Michaelis's Introduction. Wetstein, Fleischer, and Griesbach also assisted in finding out these Parisian MSS. Travis had less merit, though he paid much attention to them. In consequence of all these inquirers, the codices were tolerably well known even before Griesbach published his last edition; α is the Complutensian text; β is the cod. Cantabrigiensis D.; γ is probably cod. 4 of the gospels in Griesbach; δ is 5 of Griesbach in the gospels, Acts, and epistles; ε is 6 of the same in gospels, Acts, and epistles; ϛ of the gospels is cod. 7; ζ is 8 in the gospels, and Pauline epistles, 50 in the Acts and Catholic epistles of Griesbach; η of the gospels is L. of Griesbach; ια is Griesbach's 8 of the Acts and Catholic epistles, 10 of the Pauline; ιβ is 9 of the gospels in

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 272.

Griesbach; ιγ discovered by Marsh at Cambridge is Griesbach's 9 of the Acts and Catholic epistles, 10 of the Pauline; ιδ is 120 of the gospels in Griesbach; ιε is Griesbach's 10 in the Acts and Catholic epistles, 12 in the Pauline, 2 in the Apocalypse; ις of the Apocalypse is 3 of Griesbach. Of ια and ιε no trace has been found in modern times. The question however, in regard to this edition of Stephens is, not what MSS. he made use of in it, but *how* he used them. Did he make any or all of them the real basis of his text? It is certain he did not. His text is taken from the fifth of Erasmus with a few variations, except in the Apocalypse where the Complutensian is followed in preference. Wetstein states on Mill's authority that in the gospels, Acts, and epistles, he hardly departs from the Erasmian text twenty times, but Mill does not say so. There must be a mistake here, and the number is probably greater. Besides, Stephens often cites *all* his collated MSS. for a reading not in his text, shewing that his text was not based on his collations, but that the latter were entirely *supplemental*. If his MSS. had even been ancient, good, numerous, and collated with the greatest care, to none of which descriptions they correspond, they could not demonstrate the goodness of the text unless the text were based on them. But it was *not* so based.

All the fifteen had been collated by his son Henry. Only 598 readings according to Mill (but Marsh 578) are noted by Stephens in the margin, where the Complutensian text differs from his own. But Mill found more than 700 additional instances in which they differ. Among the 578 readings attributed by Stephens to the Complutensian edition, according to Marsh's reckoning the same distinguished scholar found 48 inaccurately ascribed to it. "Hence," says Griesbach, "every twelfth reading in Stephens' margin is erroneous."*

As Stephens follows the Erasmian text in this edition, he

* Prolegomena in Nov. Test. vol. i. p. 23, ed. Schulz.

has the words of 1 John v. 7 in the same form as he found them. But through carelessness, the semicircle is erroneously put as if the only seven MSS. of 1 John which Stephens had, omitted no more than the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, whereas they omit the entire passage from ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ to ἐν τῇ γῇ.

In 1551 appeared the fourth edition of Stephens in 8vo at Geneva, in Greek and Latin. This contains exactly the same text as the third, except in two places where it is made to agree with the first. It is remarkable as being the first into which the division of verses was introduced. Another edition, sometimes called the fifth, was published by Robert Stephens the son, at Paris 1569, in 16mo.

These last editions of Stephens were followed in the Basel edition of Oporinus, 1552 16mo; in the Frankfort editions of Wechel, 1597 fol., 1600 16mo, 1601 fol.; and in the Basel edition of Brylinger, 1563 8vo, where various readings taken from Stephens' third edition are put in the margin; but there are some not from that source. Hug says that they are from Aldus and the Vulgate. The Stephanic text of the later editions is also followed in the editions of Crispin at Geneva, 1553 8vo, 1563 12mo, 1604 16mo; in the Zurich editions of Froschover, 1559 and 1566, both octavo.

The Complutensian text chiefly, with some readings from the Erasmian, formed the basis of the text in the Antwerp Polyglott, 1571, 1572, vol. v., and of the editions published by Plantin at Antwerp in Greek and Latin, 1572, 1584 folio, and 1574, 1583 8vo. The editions of Rapheleng, Leyden, 1609, 1613 8vo, are nothing but reprints of Plantin's; which is also the case with the Commelin editions, 1599 fol., and 1616 fol.

The next person after the Complutensian editors, Erasmus and Stephens, who advanced the criticism of the Greek Testament was Theodore Beza, who had fled from France to Switzerland on account of his religion and become the disciple of Calvin at Geneva.

The first edition, properly so called, was published in 1565 folio at Geneva. The basis of the text in it was the third edition of Stephens. But Beza had more materials than those used in that edition. He got from Henry Stephens some printed edition (exemplar) of the Greek Testament prior to any of those published by the father, in which the son had noted the readings of the MSS. he had collated for his father's editions. The collection formed by H. Stephens having come into Beza's hands, and it being known that more than thirty MSS. had been *seen* by the collator, though only fifteen were actually quoted in the edition of 1550, Beza says at random, "Ad haec omnia accessit exemplar ex Stephani nostri bibliotheca cum *viginti quinque* plus minus manuscriptis codicibus." &c.

The edition is accompanied by the Vulgate, a Latin version made by Beza himself, and exegetical remarks.

The second edition appeared in 1582 folio, also at Geneva. For this impression he had the assistance of two new MSS., viz., the Clermont and the Cambridge. He also made some use of the Syriac version, and an Arabic one of some books in the New Testament. The *seventeen* MSS. of Stephens mentioned in the dedication, is a mistake for *sixteen*. The third edition was published in 1589 folio, Geneva, from which the translation of our present English Bible was *chiefly*, but not *invariably* taken. The fourth appeared in 1598 folio, Geneva.

The editions of Beza were often reprinted, especially in Holland, and contributed very much to the settlement of the text hitherto somewhat fluctuating. But though Beza had better materials than Stephens, he did not use them as well as he should have done. He does not seem to have carefully examined them, or to have applied them on any recognised principles. He acted negligently and inconstantly with regard to them. Hence his editions vary considerably. According to Wetstein, his text disagrees with Stephens' in about fifty places. He has besides expressed 150 places differently from those of his predecessor, *in his version*, or *approved of them* in

his *notes*. In 600 places at least he threw doubts on the received reading.* He preferred without reason the readings of many other editions; while he sometimes followed the Syriac version alone, or the Latin, or one or two MSS., or conjecture. Hence he was by no means a good critic; though we should not expect in that day what we do at the present.

The first Elzevir edition appeared in 1624 16mo, Leyden. The editor's name is unknown, and therefore it goes by the printer's. As to the text, it follows the third of Stephens' very closely, differing from it only in 145 places, which are enumerated by Tischendorf in various editions of his Greek Testament. The editor does not appear to have consulted any Greek MSS., for all his readings are found either in Stephens or Beza.

The second edition appeared in 1633 from the same press, in 12mo, and is the best of all the Elzevir editions. In the preface to the reader it is stated, "textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum"—words which became prophetic; for the edition became the *editio recepta* in succeeding centuries. Subsequently the latter text was repeated in 1641, 1656, 1662, 1670, 1678. It was this text which was commonly followed on the continent till of late. Perhaps we should say with Tregelles *professedly* followed, for very few, says the same critic, "really follow throughout the Elzevir text; in places in which it differs from the Stephanic they sometimes follow the latter; and sometimes they differ from both."†

From the descriptions already given we may easily discern the value of the commonly received text. It is *substantially* that of the Elzevirs. That again flowed from Beza's editions and the third of Stephens. Beza himself had mostly followed Stephens' third. The latter, with a few exceptions, was derived from the fifth of Erasmus, and from the Complutensian

* Prolegomena in N. T. vol. ii. pp. 7, 8.

† The Book of Revelation in Greek, Introduction, p. xiv.

in the Apocalypse. Erasmus again nearly repeated in his fifth the text of his fourth, in which he usually followed the Complutensian, particularly in the Apocalypse, and some modern MSS. The MSS. from which the Complutensian was printed were few and comparatively valueless. Thus the more closely the original sources of the received text are examined, the less important do they appear. The materials in possession of the earliest editors were scanty. They were of inferior quality. And those who employed them did not even make the best use of them. They did not thoroughly collate them. They took no pains to ascertain their age and value. They did not give *all* their readings. They were very negligent in citing them. Indeed, they had no critical rules by which they professed to be guided. They did not follow any definite plan in deciding between discrepant readings. All this is not to be wondered at in the infancy of criticism. It is very much what might have been expected. But it *is* matter of surprise that the same text should still be upheld as superior to all that have been more recently published with the assistance of very superior and more numerous testimonies. Nothing can be more effectual or more just than the analysis of this text given by Griesbach in a single paragraph, with the most appropriate brevity, "Editiones recentiores sequuntur Elsevirianam; haec compilata est ex editionibus Bezae et Stephani tertia; Beza itidem expressit Stephanicam tertiam, nonnullis tamen, pro lubitu fere ac absque idonea auctoritate, mutatis; Stephani tertia presse sequitur Erasmicam quintam, paucissimis tantum locis et Apocalypsi exceptis, ubi Complutensem Erasmicae praetulit; Erasmus vero textum, *ut potuit*, constituit e codicibus paucissimis et satis recentibus, omnibus subsidiis destitutus, praeter versionem Vulgatam interpolatam, et scripta nonnullorum, sed paucorum, nec accurate editorum, Patrum."*

* Prolegomena in N. T. p. xxxvii.

The editions of Stephen Curcellaeus, from the press of the Elzevirs at Amsterdam, deserve to be mentioned. The first appeared in 1658 12mo, and was reprinted in 1675, 1685, 1699. The editor gave various readings, for the first time, from two Greek MSS., beside those copied from former editions, chiefly from the Wechelian margin. He has been charged with favouring the sentiments of the Socinians. The editions of Boecler, at Strasburgh, 1645, 1660 12mo, follow the Elzevir text chiefly, with some readings from Stephens' third. The two editions of Henry Stephens, 1576, 1587 16mo, depart from Beza's text. Morin follows the Elzevir text, Paris 1628. The beautiful edition of Blaw at Amsterdam, 1633 12mo, is a mere reprint of the second Elzevir. Wetstein and Smith at Amsterdam also reprinted the text of the Elzevirs, with the Vulgate, and Arias Montanus' Latin version. It was superintended by Leusden, 1698 8vo.

Brian Walton, the celebrated editor of the London Polyglott, furnished a better and more copious collection of various readings than had appeared before in any edition, and gave a new impetus to the criticism of the text. The fifth volume of that work contains the Greek text with a Latin version, as also the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic, and in the gospels the Persic, each version with its own translation. Under the Greek text are readings from the Alexandrine MS. (A.) The collection of various readings is in the sixth volume. It contains the readings of sixteen MSS. collated under the superintendence of Ussher; the Velezian readings, which Marsh has since demonstrated to be forgeries; those which Stephens had printed in the margin, and those of Wechel, taken from Curcellaeus. Walton's text is that of Stephens' third edition.

This rich collection was enlarged by Dr. John Fell, Bishop of Oxford, in his critical edition published at Oxford in 1675 12mo. The editor, whose name does not appear in the work,

states, that he collated twelve MSS. in the Bodleian, gave the various readings of two in the library of Dublin College, of four procured from France, Marshall's extracts from the Coptic and Gothic versions, and those of twenty-two Roman MSS. collected by Caryophilus at the command of Pope Urban VIII., and afterwards published by Possinus in his Catena on Mark's gospel, Rome, 1673 folio. As stated in the title-page, the edition contains various readings from more than 100 MSS. The edition was reprinted, with additions by John Gregory, at Oxford, 1703 folio. But Gregory's extracts from the Greek fathers and Greek profane authors are of little value. The editor died before it was published. The first edition was twice reprinted in Germany, at Leipzig, in 1697 and 1702 8vo.

Here, it has been said, the infancy of the criticism of the Greek Testament terminates, and its manhood begins.

CHAPTER IX.

HISTORY OF THE PRINTED TEXT (Continued).

Dr. John Mill, encouraged and aided by Bishop Fell, gave to the world a new edition in 1707, folio, Oxford. The text is that of Stephens' third edition, accurately reprinted, with the various readings and parallel passages below. The work was the labour of thirty years, and was finished only fourteen days before his death. In it the learned editor brought together all the collections of various readings existing before his day. He also made very considerable additions, for he gave some which Fell had left in MS. He collated several ancient editions more accurately than they had been before, got extracts from Greek MSS. which had not been collated, and better extracts from others that had been examined. He also revised and increased Fell's readings from the Coptic and Gothic versions, and selected very many with his own hand from the oriental versions printed in the London Polyglott, unhappily in consequence of unacquaintedness with the originals, from their Latin translations. Nor did he neglect quotations from the fathers—a source of criticism looked upon by his patron as useless. To the work are prefixed learned prolegomena in which he accurately describes his MSS., their localities, ages, peculiarities, &c., the editions of the Greek

Testament, with various other topics, such as the formation of the canon, which few scholars even now should wish to be absent. The prolegomena were printed separately, and accompanied with notes, at Koenigsberg, by Salthenius. It has been said that the work contains no less than 30,000 various readings, many of them, doubtless, trifling, and not a few manifest *errata*. "He was too painfully accurate," says Michaelis, "in regard to trifles." In consequence of this immense collection Mill was exposed to many attacks, both in England and Germany, as though his labours tended to shake the foundation of the Christian religion. The numerous mistakes and inaccuracies which have since been found in this great work are natural; for who in such circumstances could have wholly avoided them?

Ludolph Küster reprinted it at Amsterdam in 1710 folio, adding the readings of twelve new MSS., eleven of which were collated for him by others, and one of which, viz., cod. Boernerianus (of Paul's epistles) he collated himself. Another, which has on the title page *editio secunda*, Leipzig, 1723 folio, is *the same* with a new title page.

In two editions published at Amsterdam, 1711, 1735 8vo, Gerhard of Mastricht gave various readings from Fell's collection and a Vienna MS. which he himself collated. After the preface by Henry Wetstein the publisher, are forty-three critical canons for judging of various readings by G. D. T. M. D. (Gerhardus de Trajectu Mosae doctor); prolegomena by the same; the prefaces of Curcellaeus, Fell, and Whitby. At the end are thirty-seven pages of critical notes relating to the 23d canon. Various maps accompany the work, and a great many parallel references in the inner margin chiefly taken from Mill. According to Michaelis, Mastricht was not happy in his choice of various readings. The second edition was revised by the celebrated Wetstein. The text is the Elzevir. In 1729 there appeared at London, in two volumes octavo,

" the New Testament in Greek and English, containing the original text, corrected from the authority of the most authentic manuscripts; and a new version formed agreeably to the illustrations of the most learned commentators and critics; with notes and various readings." The editor's name is not given. The first volume contains the gospels and Acts; the second, the remaining books. The critical notes are few, especially in the first volume. The editor (Mace) seems to have used no other edition than Küster's Mill for the various readings he gives; and to have collated no MS. But he has supplied a good deal by his own conjecture, and introduced readings into the text without any authority. Dr. Leonard Twells afterwards published a critical examination of it.

The first real attempt to apply the accumulated materials, or in other words to amend the *textus receptus* (for Mace's can hardly be reckoned an *earnest* attempt to do so), was made by John Albert Bengel, Abbot of Alpirspach in Wirtemburg. His edition appeared at Tübingen, 1734 4to, to which are subjoined his " Introductio in crisin Novi Testamenti," treating of MSS., versions, and editions, with critical rules; his collection of various readings taken chiefly from Mill, and an " Epilogus." The " Introductio" contains his view of families, or *recensions*, as they were afterwards called; and gave the first impulse to the investigation of that doctrine. Important additions were made to the readings selected from Mill, partly from MSS. before uncollated, partly in readings selected with more accuracy than his predecessors from ancient versions, and partly by means of extracts which, though printed, had not been brought together. Under the text are some select readings, of which Bengel expressed his opinion by the Greek letters α, β, γ, δ, ε. In forming his eclectic text, the pious editor imposed on himself the singular law not to give any thing which had not been printed before. But he was obliged to depart from this in the Revelation; for there he inserted readings not before printed.

Many opponents were raised up against him, of whom the most violent, as well as the ablest, was Wetstein.

Bengel's edition was reprinted several times at Stuttgard in 1739, 1753 8vo; at Tübingen 1762, 1776, 1790 8vo—the last superintended by his son Ernst Bengel, who introduced several improvements. They are all however without the critical apparatus, which was retained in the improved edition superintended by Burk, 1763 4to, Tübingen.

John James Wetstein, a native of Basel, contributed in no small degree to the advancement of sacred criticism by his celebrated edition of the Greek Testament, published at Amsterdam in two folio volumes, the first containing the gospels, dated 1751; the second containing the other books, 1752. He had before published *Prolegomena ad Novi Testamenti Graeci editionem accuratissimam*, in 1730 4to, treating in sixteen chapters of MSS., versions, Greek writers, editions, and other particulars. Though it was his wish to give a new and corrected text, yet various circumstances necessarily led him to print merely the *textus receptus*. But such readings as he did prefer are indicated notwithstanding, partly in the text itself by the sign of omission, partly in the inner margin by the addition of the reading he reckoned authentic. His collection of various readings, with their respective authorities, far exceeds all former works of the same kind both in copiousness and value, the fruit of untiring labour for thirty years. He corrected and increased the extracts given by Mill from editions, versions, and the fathers. Bengel's extracts from MSS. he transferred entire into his materials. He also collated anew many MSS. that had been examined only superficially, examined others for the first time, used extracts furnished to him by other parties, and employed the Philoxenian version for the first time. In search of these materials he repaired to Germany, France, Holland, England; but he obtained most in the Royal library in Paris. Upwards of 40 codices were collated by

him for the first time, or for the first time *properly*. This is exclusive of the collations he procured from others. The uncial MSS. he designated by the letters of the alphabet, and the cursive by numbers—a very convenient expedient, which has been followed by subsequent editors and critics. In addition to all this apparatus there are many *exegetical* notes, consisting for the most part of extracts from Greek, Latin, and Jewish writers, designed to elucidate the meaning of words and clauses. These annotations are often useless, having little reference to the passages to which they are appended, and contributing nothing to their right interpretation. They have also subjected him to various charges of partiality and heterodoxy.

Notwithstanding the defects and inaccuracies observable in the work, it is still indispensable to all who are occupied with sacred criticism; and will ever remain a marvellous monument of indomitable energy and diligence, united to an extent of philological learning rarely surpassed by any single man. The editor does not seem to have apprehended the doctrine of recensions, at least he has made no use of it in practice. Hence, some think that the value of the work is diminished. The prolegomena occupy a threefold place. To the gospels is prefixed that portion which relates to the authorities used in them. To the second volume is prefixed that part relating to the documents of the apostolical epistles. Similar prolegomena precede the Apocalypse. Though these prolegomena taken together are *substantially* the same as the treatise he had published twenty years before, yet many things are altered and many added. The whole contain a treasure of critical learning which few will dispense with even at the present day. They were republished by Semler at Halle (1764, 8vo), who affixed valuable notes and an appendix. The Apocalypse is followed by three tracts, the first entitled *Animadversiones et cautiones ad examen variantium lectionum N. T. necessariae*, which was the last chapter in the

former edition of the prolegomena; the second, *De interpretatione Novi Testamenti;* the third, *De interpretatione libri Apocalypseos.* At the end are two Syriac epistles of Clement of Rome, taken from a MS. of the old Syriac version. But they are not authentic, though Wetstein so believed them. We cannot do justice to this distinguished scholar, without considering him as a critic and as a theologian separately. As a critic, his judgment has been variously estimated. All must admit his *general* accuracy in collecting and arranging his materials. His diligence in amassing materials was great. His profound erudition is everywhere apparent. But his judgment in respect to the character of MSS., their value, their age, and the form of text he preferred, was hardly commensurate with his ability in collating documents, his diligence in bringing their readings together, his *general* accuracy, or his honest candour. He was probably deficient in critical tact and analysis. Where he has most erred in opinion is in respect to the value of the Vulgate version, which he unjustly depreciated. He also entertained an unfavourable opinion of the *codices Graeco-Latini*, supposing that the Greek text in them had been altered from the Latin, by which their value is greatly deteriorated. Even the MSS. whose readings coincide with the Latin, such as A. he depreciated. By these views the most ancient and important witnesses are deprived of the right of giving evidence, and the critic must have recourse to modern ones. But such opinions were combated and disproved by his annotator Semler, by Woide, Griesbach, and Michaelis. Hence, his judgment of the more ancient MSS. was not correct. Such however were not his first sentiments, as his prolegomena published in 1730 shew, where he takes a juster view of the more ancient documents.

As a theologian, he is accused of having entertained Socinian sentiments, or sentiments at least inclining that way; and perhaps the charge is not wholly unfounded, as some of

his notes will shew. But these peculiar opinions did not prejudice him as a critic, or warp his judgment. Unfortunately, his work exposed him to many attacks. Opponents appeared against him. Charges were freely adduced to injure him. But his fame has survived them all. Even Michaelis was prejudiced against him, but Marsh vindicated him against the learned professor. In 1831 appeared at Rotterdam, in royal quarto, the first volume of a new edition of Wetstein's work, enlarged and amended, professing to contain the four gospels, by J. A. Lotze. Various additions, omissions, and improvements are introduced into the prolegomena by the editor, in consequence of whose death the work was discontinued, without any part of the text having appeared.

In 1763, Mr. Bowyer, a printer in London, published the Greek Testament with a text conformable to Wetstein's ideas. Part of the second volume consisted of conjectural emendations of learned men collected together. Both were in 12mo. It would appear from the list at the end of the text that the number of alterations made in the text, exclusive of omissions, amounts to 334. In this sum the Revelation is not included, because there the changes were very numerous. Part of the second volume has been reprinted more than once, at London, 1772, 1782, 1812, with an English title.

We have next to speak of a scholar who is pre-eminently distinguished in the history of New Testament criticism, Dr. John James Griesbach. His labours in this department began with an edition of the historical books, in two volumes 8vo, published at Halle 1774, 1775, the former containing the first three gospels synoptically arranged; the latter, John's gospel and the Acts. In the year 1775 he also published the epistles and Apocalypse. But in 1777 he gave the four gospels and Acts in their natural and usual form, styling the volume, *volumen I.* to accompany the volume containing the epistles and Apocalypse which had appeared two years before.

The common text is altered according to the judgment of the editor, founded on a careful comparison of his materials. Nothing however is changed by conjecture; nor is anything taken into the text on the sole authority of versions and citations, without the sanction of MSS. The idea of *families* or *recensions* recommended by Bengel and Semler, the editor adopted and carried out with great acuteness and ability. The apparatus of various readings is placed below the text. This is carefully selected from Mill, Wetstein, and Bengel, with the omission of all extracts that were unimportant, or appeared to be mere errata, or conjectures. He corrected many mistakes that had been made by his predecessors in their quotations, especially from oriental versions. Nor did Griesbach merely sift and amend the materials already existing. He also enlarged them. He added extracts from nine MSS. in the libraries of England and France, two collated by Knittel at Wolfenbüttel, one at Giessen; and extracts from the old Latin versions published by Sabatier and Blanchini. He also gave new extracts from the Greek fathers, especially Origen. In his *Symbolae Criticae* (Halle, 2 vols. 8vo, 1785, 1793), he afterwards gave a full account of his collations. Such was the commencement of Griesbach's researches, the first fruits of those literary labours which constitute an important era in the criticism of the Greek Testament.

In 1776 was published at London in 2 vols. 12mo, Dr. Harwood's "New Testament, collated with the most approved MSS.," &c. Here the editor freely departs from the common text. Two MSS. especially are much followed, viz. the Cambridge or D. in the gospels and Acts; and the Clermont or D. in the epistles. Hence little value attaches to the edition, especially as the editor evinces strong partialities for the tenets of Arianism.

Between the years 1782 and 1788, Christian Frederick Matthaei, Professor at Moscow, published at Riga in octavo, a

new edition accompanied by the Vulgate, in twelve parts or volumes, commencing with the Catholic epistles, and ending with Matthew's gospel. His text approaches the common one, being chiefly derived from MSS. in the libraries of Moscow, which he collated for the first time. The edition contains many critical remarks, excursus, Greek scholia before unpublished, and copper plates representing the characters of his Greek MSS. The collection of various readings is taken from nearly a hundred Moscow MSS. which he generally collated throughout. It is true that some contain a small part of the New Testament, some mere fragments, very few the whole; but several of them are ancient and valuable, such as V. which belongs to the eighth century. The editor avowed himself an opponent of the recension-theory, a despiser of the ancient MSS. especially the cod. Cambridge (D.), and of quotations in the fathers. He exhibited undue predilection for his junior codices, all belonging to the Constantinopolitan family, and spoke in an unjustifiable tone of severity respecting Griesbach and others. His chief merit, therefore, lies in his having collated many new MSS. with great care, thus augmenting the materials available in the preparation of a correct text. Michaelis says, that when he began the work, he was at least an age behind the rest of Germany in the knowledge of sacred criticism.

After Matthaei's return to Germany he prepared and published a second edition in three volumes 8vo, vol. i. Wittemberg 1803; vol. ii. Curiae Variscorum 1804; and vol. iii. Ronneburgi 1807. Here the various readings are placed at the foot of the page, and the critical annotations at the end of each volume. In addition to his collations of the Moscow codices, several in Germany were examined previously to this edition, making the entire number collated by him 103. Tischendorf enumerates nearly all the places in which Matthaei

changed the text as it appears in this edition, contrary to the Elzevirs, Knapp, and Scholz.*

Before the completion of Matthaei's first edition appeared that of F. C. Alter at Vienna; vol. i. dated 1787, vol. ii. 1786, 8vo. The text is that of the Vienna MS. cod. Lambecii 1, Griesbach 218. With this text he collated twenty-two MSS. in the imperial library, giving their readings. To these he added extracts from the Coptic, Slavonic, and Latin versions. A great objection to the edition is obvious; it contains the text of a single MS., and it too not of great antiquity or value. Surely the *authentic* text is exhibited by no one copy however ancient or perfect.

In 1788 Professor Birch of Copenhagen enlarged the field of criticism by his edition of the four gospels published at Copenhagen, folio and quarto. The text is simply a reprint of Stephens' third edition, and is therefore of no use. The value of the work consists in the collection of various readings given. Extracts were taken by Birch and Moldenhauer in their critical travels, from MSS. at Rome, Vienna, Venice, Florence, the Escurial, as well as the library at Copenhagen; while Adler who travelled with them on the same errand made extracts from the Jerusalem-Syriac, and the other Syriac versions. Birch himself collated all the Greek MSS. except those in the Escurial, which were examined by Moldenhauer; and the entire number was 120. He was also the first editor who collated the cod. Vaticanus except in Luke and John, where he used a collation formerly made for Bentley. Here lies the chief value of his work. The publication of the second volume was hindered by a fire in the royal printing house, which destroyed many of the materials and put a stop to the work, at least in the form it *first* assumed. But in 1798 Birch gave to the world his collations of the Acts and epistles in an octavo volume; in 1800 in the same form, those of the Apoca-

* See his first Leipzig edition, Prolegomena, p. lxviii. et seq.

lypse; and in 1801 the various readings of the gospels revised and enlarged.

Such was the collection of new materials which had been made since Griesbach published his first edition. In preparing his second and principal edition he proceeded on the same principles as before, *selecting* the most important and valuable readings which he could find. For his object was not so much to supersede the labours of Wetstein, nor to exhibit all the extracts contained in that expensive edition and others of less compass, but to furnish a convenient and portable edition provided with such critical apparatus as might give New Testament students an adequate idea of the state of the text. Besides incorporating into the new edition the results of the labours of Matthaei, Alter, and Birch, he supplied a great many readings from Wetstein and others not given before, and noted the readings in which Stephens' third edition differs from the Elzevir. He also amended and enlarged the extracts from ancient versions, especially from the two Syriac and the Memphitic version. He examined again the copies of the old Latin version published by Sabatier and Blanchini, and took many new readings from them. He procured extracts from Latin MSS. at Emmeram, Prague, Toledo, and Vienna, and added the readings of the Vulgate version in the Sixtine edition. He procured in like manner a new collation of the Armenian version, a large number of readings from the Slavonic, and some from the Bohemian. The Sahidic and Jerusalem-Syriac also furnished readings. The quotations from the fathers were materially enlarged, especially from Origen, whose works he collated very carefully more than once. With such new materials, or more accurate extracts obtained from a re-examination of materials already employed by him, he produced, as indeed his aim was, not so much a new edition as a new work. In 1796 the first volume appeared at Halle and London, containing the four gospels; and in 1806 the second volume, both

in octavo. Very valuable prolegomena are prefixed, giving an ample account of his authorities, rules of criticism, &c.; and at the end of the last volume is a diatribe on 1 John v. 7. The work was reprinted at London in 1809, 1810, and again in 1818.

With regard to the text formed by Griesbach, he has carefully marked by means of a smaller Greek character all that he has adopted in place of what is in the received text. He has also employed marks to indicate his opinion of the degrees of probability of a reading, or the contrary. In the inner margin are put all the readings of the commonly received text which he has rejected, and various others worthy of attention. Beneath the text, under the space called the inner margin, are the authorities for the various readings. The accuracy, sound judgment, good taste, and critical ability of Griesbach are everywhere conspicuous. In these respects he excels all his predecessors. Greater reliance can be placed on his references and extracts than on any that had before appeared, though not a few mistakes have been since discovered in them, as might have been expected. We need hardly say that the volumes are indispensable to every critic, were it only for the learned prolegomena. Beautifully does Hug, no mean judge, say, "with this work he adorned the evening of a laborious and praiseworthy life, and in it left behind him an honourable memorial, which may perhaps be surpassed in respect to the critical materials it contains, but hardly in regard to delicate and accurate criticism." The text of this edition was printed in a splendid edition 4 vols. folio at Leipzig 1803-1807, without a critical apparatus, and only a few select readings. In 1805 Griesbach also published a manual edition, with a selection of readings from his larger, at Leipzig, in two parts, making one volume octavo, which was reprinted very inaccurately in 1825. The text of this manual edition does not always agree with the other. His opinion of some places differed at different times.

New materials having accumulated, a third edition was undertaken by Schulz of Breslau, and the first volume, containing the prolegomena and four gospels, published at Berlin 1827 8vo. The second volume did not appear. This edition contains various readings from nearly twenty new sources, many corrections of Griesbach's references and citations, besides several other improvements, which are all specified in a preface. The chief things which the editor did were, that he examined again the Alexandrine MS. edited by Woide, the Cambridge MS. edited by Kipling, and the Latin copies edited by Sabatier and Blanchini. To these he added a collation of the Vat. cod. B. made for Bentley, printed in the appendix to Woide's edition of the Alexandrine MS., and which frequently differs from Birch's. He also used Barrett's fac-simile of the Dublin MS. of Matthew's gospel, the collation of K. or the cod. Cyprius by Scholz, and extracts from various Paris MSS. given by Scholz in his Biblico-critical travels. He had also a Berlin MS. of the four gospels collated and described by Pappelbaum, and the readings of several MSS. (237, 238) belonging to Birch, relating to the gospels, which were not published till 1801. In addition to these, he gave the more remarkable readings of the codex Rehdigeranus, containing the Latin ante-Hieronymian version of the four gospels. He also examined the Gothic version as edited by Zahn in 1805, and the new readings contained in the fragments of it published by Angelo Mai, fragments of the Sahidic version from Oxford MSS. published in the appendix to Woide's codex Alexandrinus, and the fragments of the Bashmuric version published by Engelbreth. He had also a copy of Küster's Mill deposited in the Orphan House at Halle, containing many MS. notes relating to the readings of the Syriac, Arabic, Persian, and Ethiopic versions. He gave besides the more remarkable readings from two MSS. collated by Dermout, viz. 245 or Gronovi 131 of the four gospels, 246 or the Meermann, containing the gospels,

Acts, epistles of James, Peter, 1 John, with a fragment of that to the Romans. He says that he had also continually before him the editions of Wetstein, Bengel, Stephens, Mill, Birch, both of Matthaei, Knapp's, and Griesbach's own Leipzig one, exhibiting that form and condition of the text which Griesbach's maturest judgment thought to be just. More than eighteen pages of closely printed *addenda and corrigenda* are put at the end of the volume, consisting chiefly of Dermout's collations which did not arrive in time to be inserted in their places. It will be seen therefore, that the additions are numerous, most of them being *improvements*. Before leaving Griesbach's edition we may state the leading objection to it, viz. that the authorities given are usually for deviations from the common text, and not for the text itself.

A great many minor editions have been mainly derived from that of Griesbach, their editors following the text of this distinguished critic with more or less closeness according to their individual judgment. It is unnecessary however to dwell upon them, as they did not advance the criticism of the New Testament by the addition of any important materials. Such are the editions of Knapp (1797-1840, five editions), Tittmann, Vater, Schott, &c.

For many years previously to the appearance of his large critical edition of the Greek Testament, Dr. J. Martin Augustus Scholz, one of the Roman Catholic professors at Bonn, had been making extensive preparations for it. In 1820 he published his "Curae Criticae in historiam textus Evangeliorum commentationibus duabus exhibitae," Heidelberg, 4to, containing the result of a collation of forty-eight MSS. in the royal library at Paris, nine of which had never been collated before, and of which he collated seventeen throughout. In 1823 appeared his "Biblische-Kritische Reise in Frankreich, der Schweitz, Italien, Palaestina, und im Archipel, u.s.w." Leipzig, 8vo, containing a description of MSS. which he had examined in his

travels, and the most valuable various readings they contain. From this time he was still employed in gathering and preparing materials till at length the first volume appeared in 1830 4to, Leipzig, containing the four gospels. The second volume was published in 1836, completing the work. More than twelve years of incessant activity were spent by the editor in amassing materials for his work. He says in the preface that he visited personally public and private libraries, such as the royal library at Paris, that of Vienna, of Munich, Landshut, Berlin, Treves, London (the British Museum), Geneva, Turin, the Ambrosian at Milan, that of St. Mark's in Venice, Mute in Sicily, Parma, three in Florence, that of Bologna, nine in Rome including the Vatican, that of Naples, and those of the Greek monasteries at Jerusalem, St. Saba, and the isle of Patmos, collating either wholly or in part all the copies of the New Testament he could find in them, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, &c. with the text of Griesbach's edition. He also re-examined ancient versions, and the passages cited in the acts of Councils and works of the fathers. In addition to all this he used the readings which others had extracted from the fathers and versions, and the readings of the MSS. which others had already made public, or obligingly communicated to him. Besides the new readings, he states that he has retained such as appeared certain, and the best of the collections of Mill, Wetstein, Alter, Matthaei, Birch, and Griesbach. The prolegomena prefixed to the first volume consist of 172 pages, containing a history of the preservation of the New Testament books and their text, an exposition of his system of classification, a description of the codices, versions, fathers, and acts of Councils used by him as authorities, and some other particulars. The text is accompanied in the inner margin with the general readings characteristic of the two families into which he divides all the ancient witnesses, and those of the received text. Below it are the various readings with their authorities. To the

second volume are prefixed 63 pages of prolegomena, containing a description of the MSS. relating to that part of the work, with addenda. The whole number of MSS. described and used is 674, of which 343 had been collated by others, so that 331 were first collated by Scholz himself, *i.e.* 210 of parts of the New Testament and 121 evangelistaria. His revised text comes nearer the *received* one than Griesbach's—a fact arising from his preference of the Constantinopolitan to the Alexandrine recension. Whatever opinion may be formed of his text compared with that of his distinguished predecessor, it is certainly an improvement on the *textus receptus*. The *value* of it depends on the relative value assigned to the two classes into which Scholz divides the ancient documents. Such as prefer the readings of the most ancient MSS. will not estimate it highly; while those who are partial to the junior copies will attach more importance to it.

In judging of the merits of this edition the text can hardly attract much consideration or claim any special authority. This arises not so much from his recension theory, as from the application of the critical principles advocated. The theory is one thing, the application a very different one. His classification may be right, his ideas of the Asiatic readings correct, while the practical result at which the critic arrives may not fairly represent his ideas. A great many things may vitiate the conclusions *fairly* deducible from a good theory. Many qualities may be wanting to him by whom the operation is conducted. There are internal considerations which contribute largely to the formation of a pure text. It is not external evidence *by itself* that should be considered, but also the nature of the context, the intrinsic fitness of the readings to certain places, and a great variety of causes and influences which no rules can define, and no diplomatic criticism control or command. Sagacity, tact, skill, a delicate and nice perception of minute adaptations, acuteness, sound judgment, are required for the

successful application of *any* theory of textual criticism. In these qualifications Scholz is much inferior to Griesbach. Hence he has failed in producing a good text from his multifarious materials. He has not even been consistent with his own principles. They are not carried fully and fairly throughout the work. He might have exhibited a far better text with the same view of recensions, had he possessed the critical perception and delicate skill of his great predecessor.

If then the merit of the editor be small in regard to the text he has produced, we must look in another direction for the basis of his reputation. And here his collations of so many MSS. before unexamined, are his chief claim to the gratitude of every scholar. In this respect he has accomplished much; for he has greatly enlarged the materials of criticism. In the critical apparatus of the work of Scholz lies its value. And yet, important as that apparatus is, it is very inaccurately printed. His collations have been hasty and superficial. They are often incorrect. They cannot be relied on. Their errors are very numerous. But surely rigid accuracy in references and extracts belonging to a critical edition, is the very highest quality it can possess. It is of primary importance. And it is very remarkable, that Scholz has sometimes implicitly copied Griesbach's words, even when they lead to a different result from his own. In proof of this, we refer the reader to the note on 1 Timothy iii. 16. Even Griesbach's typographical errors are given in the text, and then copies quoted in the notes to support the variations! Thus in Apocalypse xxi. 2 κεκοσμένην, which Griesbach has in the text by a mere typographical mistake, is given by Scholz also, and in favour of κεκοσμημένην is cited cod. 2. In Apocalypse xv. 2 he gives ἔχοντες in the text, and quotes cod. 13 for ἔχοντας. In Phil. 11 he has in the text νυνὶ δὲ σοὶ καὶ εὔχρηστον, omitting ἐμοὶ after καὶ, and quotes 44, 174, 219 al. In Eph. vi. 1 he has ἡμῶν after τοῖς γονεῦσιν, citing for it I. 44, 219 al., whereas

in Griesbach it is a mere typographical error for ὑμῶν. In 2 Peter i. 15, καὶ is omitted for the same reason before ἑκάστοτε, and G. 38, 78, 80, 137, quoted for the omission. Haste, negligence, superficiality, are apparent on almost every page; and none who uses the edition can fail to see them. In short, the work wants a thorough sifting and correction, before it can be employed with facility, ease, and certainty.

After these remarks, our readers will not be surprised to learn that Scholz's edition never gained the confidence of German critics; and that a general scepticism has always prevailed with respect to his qualifications for the great task. It could not supersede Griesbach's in public estimation. Nor will it do so even in this country. Welcomed as it was with avidity, the few biblical scholars in Great Britain whose opinions *ought to guide* the many, never praised or exalted it as *the work* which was destined to take the place of all former editions. It has its importance to the critic; but that importance is by no means commensurate with the laborious preparations, the great bulk, and the high price of the work. As a whole it occupies an inferior place, not the high rank universally conceded to Wetstein's and Griesbach's, though time has unavoidably diminished the value even of their labours.

Before leaving Scholz, it is but fair to state that he has been most unwarrantably decried and blamed for having formerly proposed a theory of recensions different from that which he propounds in the prolegomena to his edition of the Greek Testament. In his first publication, whose title we gave before, he thought he had perceived a fivefold classification, into which the materials of criticism might be distributed. This however he abandoned for a twofold one. He simply changed his views on the subject. For such alteration he is rather to be *commended* than blamed. He had a perfect right to adopt another opinion, if he saw he was wrong. Nor should his former view induce any one to prejudge his later one; or to

think it erroneous because it proceeds from a man who had altered his sentiments.

In 1831 a small edition of unpretending appearance appeared at Berlin, in duodecimo, edited by Charles Lachmann. There are also copies with London on the title page. There is no preface, but at the end are 43 pages exhibiting the readings of the commonly received text where it differs from this one. A few lines at the commencement of these readings contain a reference to the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1830, pp. 817-845, for an account of the edition, and a statement that the editor has in no case followed his own judgment, but the usage of the most ancient oriental churches. The volume is neatly and accurately printed, the verses being numbered by small letters in the middle of the lines.

Words are occasionally bracketed in the text, to express doubts as to their authenticity. Others are placed at the bottom of the page when the evidence is considered to be balanced between them and those of the text.

In 1842 the first volume of a large edition appeared from the same scholar at Berlin, in octavo, with the title "Testamentum Novum Graece et Latine—Carolus Lachmannus recensuit Philippus Buttmannus Ph. F. Graece lectionis auctoritates apposuit." The second volume, containing from the Acts to the Revelation, was not *published* till 1850. In this edition as in the former, words are occasionally bracketed in the text; and readings given in the inner margin, for the same reasons. The deviations of the received text are among the critical authorities which Buttmann added. The authorities for the various readings are given under the text; and at the foot of the page stands the Vulgate, in a text chiefly formed from two ancient documents. Both editions, especially the smaller one, attracted much notice in Germany, and notwithstanding many adverse opinions and objections stated both to the editor's principles and text, they attained a degree of authority unknown to Scholz's.

The plan on which Lachmann proceeded was that proposed by Bentley, viz. to follow the authority of ancient MSS. absolutely. He has not however conformed *altogether* to Bentley's principle. His object was to present the text which was most general in the third and fourth centuries from *oriental* sources alone; meaning by that term what others have usually termed Alexandrine (and western).

His only MSS. are A. the codex Alexandrinus; B. the Vatican; C. the cod. Ephraemi; D. the cod. Cantab. in the Gospels and Acts; $\bar{\Delta}$ the cod. Claromontanus in Paul's epistles; E. cod. Laudianus in the Acts; G. cod. Boernerianus of Paul's epistles; H. the Coislin fragments of Paul's epistles; P. and Q. the Wolfenbüttel fragments of the gospels; T. Borgian Greek and Sahidic of John's gospel; Z. the Dublin MS. of Matthew's gospel; a the Vercelli Latin MS. of the gospels, b the Verona MS.; c the Colbert MS.; d the Cambridge of the gospels, Acts, and 3 John; e the Laudian of the Acts; f the Clermont of Paul's epistles; ff the St. Germain of Paul's epistles; g the Boernerian of the same; h Primasius on the Apocalypse; v the Vulgate Hieronymian version; ϛ stands for the Elzevir text of 1624. For the Vulgate as edited by him he takes principally two MSS., viz. the Fulda one F. and the cod. Laurentianus or Amiatinus L.; while V. denotes the former as corrected by Victor bishop of Capua. Other MSS. of the Vulgate were used by him, which he marks by *al.* i. e. *alii* praeter Fuldensem et Amiatinum.

As he does not come down lower than the fourth century, the only fathers cited are Irenaeus, Origen, Cyprian, Hilary bishop of Poictiers and Lucifer bishop of Cagliari.

Following these authorities and rejecting all others, he has produced a peculiar text considerably different from that presented in any other edition. The two volumes are printed in a good distinct type, but the quality of the paper is inferior.

In the prefaces prefixed to each, the editor gives an account of the nature of his work and the sources he has used, accompanied with remarks on various reviewers, objectors, and former editors, expressed with far too great asperity.

It should be observed that the text of the large edition does not always agree with that of the small one. We have observed occasional differences between them.

There is no doubt that the merits of this second work of Lachmann are very considerable. His plan is clear, definite, palpable. He draws a line between ancient and modern authorities and usually adheres to it. And if the work be meant as a *contribution* to the procurement of *the authentic* and *original* text, not *the very best representation* of that text which can be given, it must be highly valued. In the former light it is important; in the latter it is defective. We believe that Lachmann himself looked at it in the latter point of view. He has thus explained his object in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1830 (817-845), and more briefly in the preface to the first volume, where he freely allows that his text contains *erroneous* readings, and even gives examples of such.* His design was to give the best *historically attested* readings of the first four centuries from oriental sources—a design which he endeavours to carry out most consistently, even to the exhibition of widely spread *mistakes* in the text. He professes to follow *authority alone* in presenting the most *ancient form* of the text, admitting at the same time that *emendation* is necessary in order to elicit in every case the readings which proceeded from the sacred writers; but modestly refraining from such emendation because he was not a *theologian*. Had this his *true* object been perceived, it would have saved a great deal of misapprehension on the part of his censors, who have written against him through ignorance. It would have shortened, for example, the critique of Scrivener, who labours under much mistake, and prevented

* Studien und Kritiken p. 839, et seq.

him from affirming, what is not true, that Lachmann by means of his slender apparatus of critical materials, "hopes to supersede the labours of all his predecessors, and to establish on a firm foundation a pure and settled text of the Greek Testament."* Hence the edition does not satisfy the wants of general readers and students. Other editions are necessary. For it must be apparent, that the line drawn by the learned writer between *ancient* and *modern* authorities is an arbitrary one. Why does he not come down lower than the fourth century? Why does he confine himself to so few witnesses, and those belonging to one class? Why does he disregard so much the internal goodness of readings, and all those considerations arising out of the text itself, which modify and regulate the external evidence in its various applications? Has he not proceeded in a *mechanical* way, looking solely at his testimonies, few and one-sided as they are? Is he not obliged by his plan to place here and there readings in his text for which the evidence is very slender? One or two authorities are all that are available in certain cases. Thus from the fourth to the twelfth chapter of 2 Corinthians, the text given rests on cod. B. alone; and from epistle to Hebrews ix. 14 to the end, the text rests on A. alone. Such support is far too slight. In one instance at least, De Wette thinks that his plan gives a senseless reading. See Matt. xxi. 28-31. But Lachmann denies the allegation. His reply may be seen in vol. ii. pp. 5, 6 of the preface. Tregelles also justifies the reading in opposition to De Wette.† The mere mistakes also of the few ancient copies on which he relies, are given in his text, such as τὴν without ἀγαπὴν in Ephes. i. 15, and εἰ μὴν for ἢ μὴν in Heb. vi. 14. Nor is it so certain as he affirms it to be, that his principle excludes all subjectiveness and caprice. If so, why is the text of the larger edition different in several instances from that of the smaller?

* Supplement to the authorised English version, introduction, p. 26.

† Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, Jan. 1850, p. 55, et seq.

The defects of Lachmann's edition consist in the imperfect collations of MSS. on which he sometimes relied when he *might have* availed himself of much better ones. These have been pointed out by Tischendorf. Besides, he has not *always* been consistent in following out his own principles. Tischendorf has given a number of instances where his text is incorrect.*

Before the appearance of the first volume of Lachmann's large edition, that of Tischendorf had been published at Leipzig, 1841, square 12mo, containing a selected text, and the most important readings, with the variations found in the leading critical editions. The text was based mainly on ancient Alexandrine (and western) authorities, being formed after those of Griesbach and Lachmann, the latter in particular. The influence which Lachmann's authority had upon the editor is apparent. It was a useful manual on the whole; but as it is now superseded by another, we forbear to make farther remarks on it. The prolegomena are *now* the only part of it worth having, containing, (I.) a copious discussion of recensions, with special reference to Scholz's theory; (II.) the plan pursued in preparing the edition; (III.) the editions collated with the text of his own; (IV.) an index of the critical aids, MSS. versions, fathers, and ecclesiastical writers.

Tischendorf also published three editions at Paris in 1842, two dedicated to Archbishop Affre, and one to M. Guizot. One has the Latin Vulgate in a parallel column, and the Greek text conformed as often as MS. authorities would allow to the Clementine Latin. Another has the same Greek text without the Latin and without the various readings at the end. The third, or *Protestant* one, has a text nearly the same with the Leipzig of 1841, without a critical apparatus, but with the variations of the editions of Stephens, Elzevir, and Griesbach at the end.

* Prolegomena in editionem secundam Lipsiensem, pp. 45, 46.

In the meantime, the critical materials had been accumulating. The year before the publication of Lachmann's smaller edition Rinck had made known the results of a careful collation of seven MSS. in the library of St. Mark's at Venice. Reiche had published extracts from several Paris MSS. in 1847. Rettig had published a beautifully lithographed copy of the cod. Sangallensis; and above all Tischendorf himself had been incessant in his collation and publication of MSS. preserved in various countries. He had published the text of C. or the codex Ephraemi, in 1843; and "Monumenta sacra inedita," in 1846, containing the text of nine MSS. including L. of the gospels, with the purple fragments I. N. Γ., the Barberini fragment Y. the Paris fragment W. and others. Of Latin MSS. he published the Evangelium Palatinum in 1847, a copy of the gospels at Vienna on purple vellum; and the codex Amiatinus, far more correctly than Fleck, in 1850. Accordingly, a second and much improved edition appeared at Leipzig in 1849, in one vol. 12mo, to which are prefixed two prefaces, and 96 pages of prolegomena. The text of this edition is very much superior to that of 1841, and differs considerably from Lachmann's, though based mainly on *ancient* authorities. It is also in every way more correctly printed, though by no means faultless, for even the critic's own MS. collations are not faithfully copied in the *printed* text. On the whole, it is the best critical edition which has been published for such as desire to have *but one*. It is both portable and cheap. There are indications in the text here and there of rash and hasty judgment. Perhaps the learned editor was not controlled throughout by very definite or fixed principles on which to form his text; for though he has always had regard to external authority, he has not been able in all instances to suppress an arbitrary and subjective tendency unfavourable to calm impartiality.*

* See an able review of it by Tregelles, in Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature for October 1849 and January 1850.

In 1846 appeared at Hamburgh a very small volume (square 18mo) containing the New Testament in Greek, chiefly after the text of the Vatican MS., by Eduardus de Muralto. This was followed two years after by a larger edition, with prolegomena extending to 115 pages. The prolegomena treat of the collations of the early fathers, the use of the versions, the Vatican MS. (B), other MSS., of which collations are given, a table of all the passages in the New Testament either cited or referred to by the earlier fathers, with references to the most ancient Slavonic Evangelistarium, &c. After the text are the various readings of certain MSS., the Syriac version, the Slavonic, &c., the whole ending with a small lexicon of grammatical and orthographical forms found in many ancient MSS.

As to the text itself it merely professes to be that of the Vatican MS., not a critical text. Marks of various kinds, such as brackets, parenthetic signs, &c., are employed where other leading MSS. exhibit some variation. The pastoral epistles, and end of that to the Hebrews, are supplied from H. or the Coislin MS., and where that is defective from cod. Passionei (J). The Apocalypse is taken from B. or 2066, formerly Basilianus 105, published by Tischendorf.

According to the editor's own account, he had the collations of B. by Bartolocci and Birch, furnished with which he was allowed three days to *examine* the MS. (perlustrandus) in 1844, which time he states to be sufficient to remove the differences between the two collations by ascertaining the true reading. As far as his text goes, it agrees in the main with Bartolocci's collation. Unfortunately, however, doubt rests on the statement whether Von Muralt ever *used* the MS. itself. One thing is certain, that the text published is by no means a faithful or accurate representation of that in the MS. It is very incorrect. The editor did not employ the collation made for Bentley. Hence the edition is all but worthless to the critic. We refer to a critique upon it by Tischendorf at

p. 47 of his preface, where it is handled very severely, "opus est incredibili inscitia, socordia, perfidia."

Such is a brief history of the principal labours that have been expended on the text of the Greek Testament, with the view of bringing it nearer to the state in which it first appeared. The materials have gradually accumulated till the present time. But they are still in an incomplete state. If one person had applied himself to the thorough collation of a really valuable MS., instead of amassing a heap of extracts necessarily imperfect and often inaccurate, criticism would have been in a better condition. The thing most wanted is good fac-similes of the best MSS., or at least collations of them which can be relied on as every where accurate—collations which should save other scholars the trouble of re-examining the same documents. But this is the work of time. Every year is doing something for the purification of the text. Critical editors and collators appear, who, amid all disadvantages, pursue their arduous task of exploring those ancient monuments which contain the text of the Christian records. Here the name of Tischendorf is conspicuous, who has already brought to light many valuable codices and fragments, making them accessible to the learned, and is still ardent in the same work. Others might be named who are now and have been for some years engaged in the same pursuit, the fruits of whose labours will ere long, we trust, appear. Dr. S. P. Tregelles is one of them, who has been preparing a large critical edition of the Greek Testament for many years. We look for the completion of his great undertaking with solicitude, hope, and high expectations, knowing that he unites in himself most of the qualities which will ensure a critical edition worthy of comparison with any of the continental ones. We believe that his accuracy in making collations and faithfully recording them is superior to that evinced by any of the great editors, Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, or Tischendorf.

Having thus given a history of the text printed as well as unprinted, and having shewn the various attempts made to restore it to its pristine purity, we may add a few words on the general result obtained. The effect of it has been to establish the genuineness of the New Testament text in all important particulars. No new doctrines have been elicited by its aid; nor have any historical facts been summoned by it from their obscurity. All the doctrines and duties of Christianity remain unaffected. Hence the question arises, of what utility has it been to the world? Why have all this labour and industry been applied? Have all the researches of modern criticism been wasted? We believe they have not. They have proved one thing—that in the records of inspiration there is no material corruption. They have shewn successfully that during the lapse of many centuries the text of Scripture has been preserved with great care; that it has not been extensively tampered with by daring hands. It is not very different from what it was 1700 years ago. Critics with all their research have not been able to shew that the common text varies essentially from what they now recommend as coming nearest its earliest form. It is *substantially* the same as the text they propose. Thus criticism has been gradually building a foundation, or rather proving the immovable security of a foundation on which the Christian faith may safely rest. It has taught us to regard the Scriptures as they now are to be divine in their origin. We may boldly challenge the opponent of the Bible to shew that the book has been materially corrupted. Empowered by the fruits of criticism, we may well say that the Scriptures continue essentially the same as when they proceeded from the writers themselves. Hence none need be alarmed when he hears of the vast collection of various readings accumulated by the collators of MSS. and critical editors. The majority are of a trifling kind, resembling differences in the collocation of words and synony-

mous expressions which writers of different tastes evince. Confiding in the general integrity of our religious records, we can look upon a quarter or half a million of various readings with calmness, since they are so unimportant as not to affect religious belief. We can thank God that we are able to walk without apprehension over the sacred field he has given us to explore. Our faith in the integrity of his word is neither a blind nor superstitious feeling, when all the results of learning incontestably shew that the present Scriptures may be regarded as uninjured in their transmission through many ages; and that no effort of infidelity can avail to demonstrate their suppositious character. Let the illiterate reader of the New Testament also take comfort by learning, that the received text to which he is accustomed is substantially the same as that which men of the greatest learning, the most unwearied research, and the severest studies have found in a prodigious heap of documents. Let him go forward with a heart grateful to the God of salvation, who has put him in possession of the same text as is in the hands of the great biblical editors whose names stand out in the literature of the Scriptures. "Of the various readings of the New Testament," says Mr. Norton, "nineteen out of twenty, at least, are to be dismissed at once from consideration, not on account of their intrinsic unimportance—that is a separate consideration—but because they are found in so few authorities, and their origin is so easily explained, that no critic would regard them as having any claim to be inserted in the text. Of those which remain a very great majority are entirely unimportant. They consist in different modes of spelling; in different tenses of the same verb or different cases of the same noun, not affecting the essential meaning; in the use of the singular for the plural, or the plural for the singular, where one or the other expression is equally suitable; in the insertion or omission of particles, such as ἀν and δε, not affecting the sense, or of the article in

cases equally unimportant; in the introduction of a proper name, where, if not inserted, the personal pronoun is to be understood, or of some other word or words expressive of a sense which would be distinctly implied without them; in the addition of 'Jesus' to 'Christ,' or 'Christ' to 'Jesus;' in the substitution of one synonymous or equivalent term for another; in the transposition of words, leaving their signification the same; in the use of an uncompounded verb or of the same verb compounded with a preposition—the latter differing from the former only in a shade of meaning. Such various readings, and others equally unimportant, compose far the greater part of all, concerning which there may be or has been a question whether they are to be admitted into the text or not, and it is therefore obviously of no consequence in which way the question has been or may be determined."*

* Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i. additional notes, pp. 38, 39 (American edition).

CHAPTER X.

ANCIENT VERSIONS.

THE PESHITO.

HAVING completed our history of the New Testament text, we proceed to describe the sources whence various readings are derived, and by which it may be restored to its original condition. As already stated, these are four, viz. ancient versions, manuscripts, quotations, and conjecture. Let us consider the first.

Among ancient versions of the New Testament, the first place is due to the old Syriac or Peshito. Allusion has been made in the first volume to the *name* and *age* of this version. But in regard to the latter, there are certain circumstances belonging to the New Testament part which deserve to be noticed.

The fact that the version wants the second and third epistles of John, the second of Peter, that of Jude and the Apocalypse has been employed as an argument in favour of its antiquity. The translator must have made his version, it is asserted, either before these books were written, or at least before they were acknowledged in Syria as of divine authority. But the fact of its wanting these portions does not necessarily or consistently carry it up to the close of the first or the earlier part of the second century. Nor do the other

arguments that have been adduced by Michaelis* and Laurence† render this high antiquity either probable or certain. Bishop Marsh has shewn‡ that the arguments of Michaelis are invalid; and Laurence has failed to refute his statements. No man could think, as Marsh rightly affirms, of translating the Greek Testament before its several parts were collected and united in a volume, that is, before the canon was formed. But the canon was not formed before the middle of the second century. Hence we should not assign the origin of the version to an *earlier* date; nor can it be brought lower down than the time of Ephrem, or beyond the middle of the fourth century. It belongs in all probability to the end of the second or beginning of the third; and the fact of its wanting certain books may be explained by the non-reception of them in the district where the version was made. They were not acknowledged there as of equal authority with the other parts of the New Testament. Nor need we be surprised at this; since the same epistles and treatises were suspected or positively rejected in other countries. In the east these writings belonged for a considerable time to the ἀντιλεγόμενα class of Eusebius. The fact is significant that the version contains the epistle to the Hebrews, which was not received in some places for a time; but there was less doubt of that epistle in the east than in the west.

But whatever date be assigned to the origin of the version, none can well separate the New Testament part from the Old by attempting to give them very different dates. In the absence of all historical notices about either being first translated, they must be classed nearly together. Internal evidence goes so far as to shew that the Old preceded the New, since the quotations from the Old Testament are usually

* Introduction to the New Testament by Marsh, vol. ii. pp. 31, 32.

† Dissertation upon the Logos, pp. 67-75.

‡ Notes to Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 551, et seq.

given in the New from the Peshito, but it is not likely that the two parts of this version were widely separated in origin.

There is no doubt that the Peshito was made immediately from the Greek. Nor has any other opinion ever been entertained. No hypothesis that it was made from some Latin translation has at any time prevailed. Bengel hazarded *a conjecture* that possibly it was not taken immediately or solely from the Greek, but that the translator *also* made use of the Latin version.* And even Bengel's doubts did not respect the genuine Peshito, but merely our printed editions. Hence it is absurd to argue against an opinion which none ever believed.

Two circumstances are sufficient to shew the version's immediate derivation from the original. There are mistakes and misconceptions which find their explanation in no other cause than the Greek text lying at the basis; and there are many Greek words which recur frequently, because the translator found them repeatedly used in the original before him.

(*a.*) Ἕτερος is confounded with ἑταῖρος in Luke xiv. 31; 1 Corinth. iv. 6, xiv. 17; 2 Corinth. viii. 8. Καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν and ἐκολλήθησαν are similarly confounded in Mark vi. 1. So too ἐπουράνιος and ὑπουράνιος in Eph. vi. 12. ἔῤῥιψεν and ἔῤῥηξεν were also mistaken for one another in Luke ix. 42.

It is possible however that all, or at least some of these, may be owing to transcribers. In 1 Peter i. 13, χαράν and χάριν were confounded; in Matt. xxi. 41, κακῶς κακῶς is translated, instead of κακοὺς κακῶς; in Acts xvi. 29, αἰτήσας is confounded with αἰθήσας. In Acts xiii. 12 there is a false construction, *miratus est et credidit in doctrinam Domini.*

(*b.*) ἀνάγκη occurs in Matt. xviii. 7, Heb. ix. 23; στοιχεῖα,

* "Coptica versio et Syriaca valde inter se, et cum Latinis congruunt: ambae autem permultis in locis Graecos codices a Latinis desertos ita sequuntur, ut fere pro immediatis haberi mereantur."—Introductio in crisin N. T. p. 44.

Gal. iv. 9, Colos. ii. 8, 20; στάσις in Mark xv. 7; τιμή, Matt. xxvii. 6, Acts v. 2; ἀγρός, Matt. xxvii. 7, 8, 10, Mark vi. 36; ἀγών, Phil. i. 30, Colos. ii. 1, &c.; ξένος, Matt. xxv. 35, 38, 43, 44, Heb. xi. 13, &c.

Hug discovered in the 27th chapter of Matthew's gospel alone no less than eleven Greek words, for which the translator might have found equivalent ones in his own language.*

The *original* extent of this version has been matter of debate. All known MSS. of it with one exception, contain the four gospels, the Acts, fourteen epistles of Paul, including that to the Hebrews, first of Peter, first of John, and the epistle of James. Internal evidence abundantly attests that the Bodleian MS. containing other catholic epistles, does not exhibit them as a constituent part of the genuine Peshito. Is the Peshito therefore, as we are able at present to determine its extent, the same as it was at first? Did the MSS. of it never contain the portions now wanting?

Hug believed that it had them at first.† The Apocalypse gradually disappeared, as he thinks, in the fourth century. The other portions also fell away before the sixth century. The proof of this is derived from Ephrem. That writer frequently refers to the Apocalypse in his works. But he could not have done this had not a Syriac version of it existed, as he did not know Greek. In like manner he cites Jude, 2 Peter, 2 John. There is little probability in the view thus propounded by Hug; and accordingly it has remained peculiar to himself. It is not very clear that Ephrem was quite unacquainted with Greek. Hug indeed produces the testimony of Sozomen and Theodoret to that effect—these writers declaring him to be without ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία so that in his intercourse with the Greeks he had to employ an interpreter. Yet it does not follow from this that he was without so much Greek as prevented him from reading the books of the Bible, especially

* Einleitung, u. s. w. vol. i. p. 301. † Ibid, pp. 306, 307.

as he often alludes in his works to the difference of the Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac reading of a passage. And then the gradual falling away of certain books from the version is incredible. What could have caused so unusual a phenomenon? By what means was it effected? What adequate motive could have led to it? If there was a version of the four epistles in question, with the Apocalypse, not connected with the Peshito, in the time of Ephrem, as is *possible*, it must have shared the fate of many ancient works, having totally perished. In any case, it is quite *improbable* that if a version did exist in the days of Ephrem it was a part of the Peshito.

On the other hand, Michaelis thought that the epistle to the Hebrews is not a genuine part of the old Syriac. When the writer of the epistle refers to the Old Testament, the passages are quoted according to the Peshito, and therefore it must have been translated later than the other books of the New Testament in which this is not the case; for the Christians translated first the New Testament and then the Old into Syriac. Michaelis also refers to a difference in the modes of expression, such as, in the other books of the New Testament ܟܗܢܐ is used to signify *a priest*, and ܪܒ ܟܗܢܐ *a high-priest;* but in the epistle to the Hebrews, we find constantly instead of these terms ܟܘܡܪܐ and ܪܒ ܟܘܡܪܐ.* These proofs are satisfactorily answered by Hug, who has shewn that in regard to quotations, the same thing which occurs in the epistle to the Hebrews occurs also in the gospels, Acts, and epistles, so that the argument founded on the citations proves too much. So far from the New Testament having been translated first, it followed that of the Old Testament, for the quotations in the former generally agree with and are copied from the latter. In relation to the conclusion drawn from the different terms for *priest* and *high-priest* in the epistle to the Hebrews and the other books, it should not be inferred from a

* See Introduction to the N. T. by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 5.

circumstance so slight that there was a different translator. "To maintain the fact of different translators from the use of different expressions, will require a more extensive induction than one of three or four words."*

On the whole, we cannot but believe, till new evidence has been produced, that the Peshito wanted at first the four epistles already named, together with the Apocalypse, and that the letter to the Hebrews is a genuine part of it.

Its original extent was such as it had in the ancient MSS. used by Widmanstadt and Moses of Mardin in making the first printed edition; and other books, not to say smaller passages, should never have been associated with it by later editors. It ought to have been kept distinct in its own proper contents.

The question has been started, whether the version was made by one or more translators. It is very difficult however to answer it satisfactorily. In regard to the four gospels, there is no doubt that only one person was employed on them. There are an equability and uniformity in words and phrases which indicate one and the same scholar. But in the Acts and epistles there is a perceptible difference. There the manner is more free, as Hug perceived, and others since his time have also observed.† But the alteration can hardly be called *essential.* It is true that in these portions many words and formulae are employed which do not occur in the gospels, or occur there less frequently. But the variation is scarcely sufficient to justify the hypothesis of different translators. All books do not require precisely similar treatment. Nor does one person always follow consistently and uniformly the same mode of translation. Many circumstances may influence him in taking more latitude at one time than another. We should therefore hesitate to assume more than one translator. At

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 312.

† Wichelhaus, De Novi Test. versione Syriaca antiqua, etc. p. 86, note.

least, evidence has not yet been furnished sufficient to support another conclusion. The question remains unsettled.

The general character of the version is freedom, ease, and propriety. It is neither very literal like the Philoxenian, so as to present a stiffness of style; nor is it paraphrastic. On the contrary, a happy medium is followed. The language is on the whole pure, and the idioms well rendered out of Greek into Syriac. But we cannot believe with Michaelis, that it is "*the very best* translation of the Greek Testament he ever read;" or "that it must be ever read with profound veneration," since there is not "a single instance where the Greek is so interpreted as to betray a weakness and ignorance in the translator."* The version is an excellent one; but it has errors and mistakes. The translator was master of the two languages, and executed a very difficult task most successfully. But it is far from being as accurate or as uniformly good as it might have been. And yet its general excellence and great antiquity place it above any other ancient translation of the Greek Testament, conspiring to give it an authority which none other can justly claim. Hence it must always be consulted as an important document, in the criticism and interpretation of the New Testament.

Let us notice some peculiarities of it, shewing the degree of freedom in which the Syriac interpreter indulged.

He has omitted, added, and changed in many cases. Thus he has—

1. *Omitted particles*, such as conjunctions and adverbs. To the former belong γάρ, Matt. iii. 2; καί, always in the formula θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, Eph. i. 3, &c.; ὅτι, in such cases as Matt. xix. 8, xx. 12, xxvii. 47; οὖν, Matt. vi. 9; δέ, Matt. ii. 3; μέν, Eph. iv. 11; τε, Eph. i. 10. To the latter belong ἔτι, Matt. xviii. 16; ἤδη, Matt. xiv. 15; ἰδού, Matt. i. 20; νῦν, Eph. ii. 2; τότε, Matt. xxii. 21.

* Introduction to the N. T. by Marsh, vol. ii. pp. 40, 41.

He has also omitted *synonymes*, as in James i. 17, δόσις καὶ δώρημα; Matt. xxiv. 24, σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα.

Words immediately preceding are not repeated, as Ἰησοῦς in Matt. xvi. 6; ἦλθον in Matt. v. 17.

Pronouns are omitted, as οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος, Matt. xi. 7, xiii. 38; αὐτός and αὐτοῦ, Matt. vi. 7; ὑμῶν, Eph. vi. 5.

In like manner *adjectives* are neglected, as ὅλος and πᾶς, Matt. xv. 17, xxvi. 56, xxvii. 1.

Verbs not of much consequence to the sense being apparently redundant were also left out, as the copula εἰμί, Eph. v. 10; ἀποκριθείς, Matt. xv. 26, 28; ἄρον, Matt. xvii. 27. So with λέγων, ἐλθών, λαβών, ἀναστάς.

What appeared likely to embarrass the construction or to obstruct the sense or connection, was also omitted, as in Eph. ii. 16, ἐν αὐτῷ.

2. In other instances the translator *added* rather than omitted, and sometimes the same words too which he had elsewhere left out or neglected. This was done in

Synonymous words as in Eph. vi. 17; Matt. xiii. 48, xiv. 19.

Words which immediately preceded were *repeated*, as Ἰησοῦς in Matt. iv. 19.

What seemed likely to facilitate the meaning of a passage, or to connect the thread of discourse more closely together was subjoined, as in Eph. i. 2, ﻟﻪ. See also i. 9, Eph. iii. 6, promissio quae *data est*, &c.

Words that presented themselves spontaneously and naturally were added, as in Acts xiv. 7, *city* was added to Lystra. *Simon* to *Cephas*, Matt. xxvi. 58, *house of* Israel for Israel, Matt. x. 23; Jesus *Christ* for Jesus, Eph. i. 15; Judas *the traitor* for Judas simply, Matt. xxvi. 47.

In like manner verbs not at all necessary to the sense were inserted, as the copula εἰμί, Eph. ii. 7; the verb ܐܙܠ, Matt. ii. 8.

Some adjectives that readily presented themselves to the mind were also inserted, as πᾶς, Eph. vi. 7; εἷς, Eph. iv. 13.

Pronouns were often added, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, αὐτός, Eph. i. 6, 11, 14; αὐτοῦ, ἐμοῦ, σοῦ, Eph. i. 6, ii. 1, ii. 7, &c.

In like manner particles were inserted, including conjunctions and adverbs, as ἀλλά, Eph. ii. 8; γάρ, Eph. iv. 5; ἤ, Eph. v. 5; καί, Matt. vi. 22; οὖν, Eph. v. 8; ἰδού, Eph. i. 15; τότε, Matt. v. 12.

3. The translator also *changed* words and phrases. Thus he changed *single words* as *substantives* into adjectives, κυβεία, Eph. iv. 14; into pronouns, Eph. iv. 13; into verbs, Eph. i. 6; into adverbs, Eph. ii. 3, φύσει, *plane.*

Adjectives were changed into substantives, Eph. i. 3.

Pronouns were changed into substantives, Eph. iv. 15, εἰς αὐτόν, into *Christ.*

In like manner the *relative* was altered into the demonstrative, as Eph. i. 11.

Verbs were changed into substantives, as Eph. iv. 16, αὔξησιν ποιεῖται in incrementum *corporis.*

Particles were also changed, as διά into the genitive, Eph. iii. 12; εἰς into the nominative, Eph. v. 31; ἐκ into the genitive, Matt. xxiv. 17; ἐν into the nominative, Eph. ii. 7; into the genitive, Eph. ii. 11. Thus also several prepositions could not well be distinguished in Syriac the one from the other, as εἰς and ἐν, ὑπό, παρά, ἀπό, μετά, and πρός.

Synonymes were changed, as Eph. iv. 18, v. 4.

In regard to *declension*, one case was changed into another, as Matt. xx. 27, ὑμῶν δοῦλος into ὑμῖν δοῦλος. Unity is multiplied, as Eph. iii. 3, ἐν ὀλίγῳ.

As to *conjugation*, the active was altered into the passive, Eph. i. 10. The passive into the active, Eph. ii. 5. Instead of the imperative was put the *future*, Eph. iv. 27, or the *conjunctive*, Eph. ii. 16. The persons are changed, as in Eph. ii. 5. The tenses are likewise altered, such as the present

into the *past*, Matt. xiii. 51, or the *future*, Matt. xxiv. 40. The preterite is made a *present*, Eph. v. 29, and the future a present, Eph. vi. 21.

The order of words was transposed, as in Eph. i. 1. Thus adjectives were put *before* substantives, as ἐκείνῳ, Eph. ii. 12, or put *after* them, as Eph. ii. 4, πολλήν. Verbs are put first, as Eph. i. 22, ὑπέταξεν. What were separate in the original were put together, as Eph. ii. 3, and *vice versa* Eph. i. 12. Sentences were transposed, as Eph. vi. 2, &c. &c.

In the same way λόγος is put before πνεῦμα, in 2 Thes. ii. 2; Paul before Barnabas, Acts xiii. 2, 7, xv. 12, 25; the principal men of the city before the women, Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 12; Iconium before Antioch, Acts xiv. 19; the Sadducees before the captain of the temple, Acts iv. 1; Jesus's mother before his brethren, Mark iii. 31. There are also various changes made in order to explain the sense of words or clauses more clearly. Thus in Acts xxiii. 27, 31, στρατιῶται is rendered *Romani;* in Matt. xvii. 19, ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό, *sanare illum;* προσκαρτεροῦντες . . . . . καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς is translated, *et communicabant in precatione et in fractione eucharistiae;* ἄρτος τῆς προθέσεως *panis mensae Domini;* οὐκ ἔξι κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν, *non sicut justum est die Domini nostri, comeditis et bibitis.*

We need not follow this subject into farther details, but refer to Winer,* Loehlein,† and Rueckert,‡ of whose works De Wette§ has made good use; and also to Wichelhaus.‖

* De versionis N. T. Syriacae usu critico caute instituendo, 1823; and Observationes in epistolam D. Jacobi ex versione Syriaca, maximam partem criticae, 1827.

† Syrus, epistolae ad Ephesios interpres, &c. 1835.

‡ Der Brief Pauli an die Ephesier erläutert und vertheidigt, 1834.

§ Einleitung, p. 14.

‖ De Novi Testamenti versione Syriaca antiqua quam Peschitho vocant, &c. 1850.

The essay of Loehlein is the most valuable and thorough of all, though professedly extending only to the Ephesian epistle.

The examples already given might be extended indefinitely, but they must suffice to indicate the general character of the version, and the sort of license which the translator took from choice or necessity.

A more important thing, and that with which we have chiefly to do, is *the nature of the Greek text at the basis of the Peshito.*

The Greek text followed by the translator bears upon it the marks of a high antiquity. He lived near the country where the first collection of the sacred writings was made, and in a land where learned fathers had flourished who were able *to write* in Greek, so complete masters were they of that language. Hence the Syriac interpreter could not fail to have an ancient copy to serve as the ground-work of his version. The ability too which he has displayed, shews him in the light of a scholar familiar with the language and writings of the New Testament books, who could judge of the goodness of a MS. Hence we must believe that he consulted one of the best copies he could procure, in the preparation of his important work.

When we compare the text of the Peshito with the oldest critical authorities, its importance is readily perceived. These are Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and the old Latin version used by Tertullian and other fathers. But as Irenaeus' works have for the most part survived only in a Latin version, they cannot be very exactly employed for collation with the text of the Peshito. Subtracting them there remain Clement and the old Latin, with which the text of the Peshito has a striking coincidence. In passages where the three coincide, the reading must be considered as one of the oldest. And the number of such

coincidences is not small. Of course where they *do* take place, the readings they exhibit are entitled to great attention. We shall adduce a few examples of their agreement.*

Matt. xv. 8, ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χειλεσίν με τιμᾷ. The received text has several other words which are not genuine.

Matt. xviii. 10, ἐν οὐρανοῖς after οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν is omitted. It was probably a gloss.

Mark x. 27, παρὰ δὲ τῷ θεῷ δυνατόν.

But although the readings of these three authorities be entitled to great weight, they must not be at once received as the original ones. They should be judged of by *all* the evidence, and admitted or rejected accordingly.

A few examples may now be given where the Peshito and old Latin coincide. These are very abundant; and the readings are valuable in which the agreement occurs.

Mark i. 2, ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ; i. 19, προβὰς ὀλίγον, 24, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί without ἔα; i. 42, καὶ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν κ. τ. λ.; Matt. vi. 18, ἀποδώσει σοι; Gal. iii. 1, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ' κ. τ. λ.; Matt. vi. 15, τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν of the received text is omitted; vii. 29, ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι; ix. 15, νηστεύειν; ix. 35, ἐν τῷ λαῷ is omitted.

As the text of the Peshito agrees with the old Latin, it agrees of course with D. or the codex Cantabrigiensis in the gospels and Acts, and to a considerable extent with the cod. Claromontanus in the Pauline epistles. Thus Michaelis found that in the first twenty-two chapters of the Acts, the cod. Cantab. and Peshito coincide in seventy-seven readings, and in the first ten chapters of Mark's gospel in twenty readings found in no other MS.†

But though the Peshito is very frequently accompanied by the old Latin in its readings, and by the oldest class of MSS., yet it has others peculiar to itself, or nearly so. Among

* Eichhorn's Einleitung, vol. iv. § 58, p. 415, et seq.

† Curae in versionem Syriacam Actuum apostolicorum, pp. 163, 164.

these may be specified Mark ii. 8, ὅτι ταῦτα διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; Heb. ix. 20, πρὸς ὑμᾶς is omitted; Romans v. 7, *pro improbis*, thus reading along with the Erpenian Arabic taken from it, ἄδικος instead of δίκαιος; Luke viii. 22, καὶ ἀνήχθησαν is left out. So too the Persian. In Matt. vi. 13 the doxology is inserted, with the Ethiopic, Persian, Armenian, &c. Matt. xxviii. 18 these words are added, καὶ καθῶς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατήρ μου, κἀγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς, which are also in the Persian. They are transferred from John xx. 21. In Mark vi. 11, the words ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομόρροις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ are appended, taken from Matt. x. 15. They are also in the Persian.

But it is likely that some of these readings have been added to the genuine text since it was made from the Greek; for the present printed Peshito is taken from comparatively junior MSS., and we know that the oldest ones differ in many instances from the printed text.*

There is no good reason for supposing, as Bengel apparently did, that the Syriac translator made use of the old Latin version. They were independent of one another as two separate documents circulating at the same time in different countries; and the similarity of the text lying at the basis of each must be explained by their antiquity.

The version before us has been perplexing to Griesbach in relation to his system of recensions; for he could not well assign it to the western, the Alexandrine, or the Constantinopolitan recension. At one time he conjectured that it had been repeatedly revised at different times after different Greek MSS;† but at a later period‡ that it had undergone only *one* such revisal after a certain kind of Greek text. The opinion of Hug is more probable, who refers it to the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, in

* See De Wette's Einleitung, pp. 14, 15; and Eichhorn, Einleit. vol. iv. § 58.

† Prolegomena in N. T. p. 72, ed. Schulz.

‡ Meletema II. in his Commentarius Criticus, &c. Partic. ii. pp. 51, 52.

which Eichhorn, Winer, and Muralt coincide. Both the old Latin and it belong to the most ancient period of text, and therefore they agree so strikingly.

On the whole, the text at the basis of the Peshito has most resemblance to D. Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, and the old Latin. There are also places in which its readings are exhibited in the best ancient copies, such as A. B. C. D. E.* It is an old and valuable document.

But though this be the prevailing character of its text, yet it exhibits Asiatic readings also. It approaches in not a few cases the text of Chrysostom. It favours the *textus receptus*. This indeed might have been expected from its birth-place. The extent however to which it agrees with the received text has not been investigated; for greater attention has been given to its *ancient* readings, or at least to what critics have judged so, because they are found in contemporary documents and authorities. There is little doubt that it approaches to the received text oftener than has been suspected.†

Let us now refer to a few prominent readings in this version which attract the critic's notice, and whose appearance is capable of various explanations.

In Matt. x. 8, the words νεκρούς ἐγείρετε are not in the Peshito. They are indeed in most editions, including Schaaf's, but they are not in the Vienna one; and it may therefore be fairly presumed that they do not belong to the genuine Peshito.

In Matt. xxvii. 9, Ἱερεμίου the name of the prophet is omitted. The margin of the Philoxenian has *Zechariah* instead of Jeremiah.

In Matt. xxvii. 35, ἵνα πληρωθῇ——κλῆρον are not in the version. Nor do we suppose that they were in the Greek copy or copies lying before the translator.

* Michaelis, Curae in versionem Syriacam, &c. p. 177, et seq.

† See Wichelhaus, pp. 268, 269.

The last twelve verses of Mark's gospel belong to the version.

In Luke i. 75, the clause ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ is omitted.

Acts viii. 37, is wanting. Schaaf has it improperly in the text.

In Acts xv. 34, the whole verse is left out.

Acts xxviii. 29, is also wanting, and rightly so.

A peculiar reading occurs in Acts xviii. 7, where *Titus* is in the Syriac for the Greek *Justus*. For this Hug offers an ingenious explanation. The translator in his opinion divided the Greek terms thus ΟΝΟΜΑ—ΤΙΙΟΥΣ—ΤΟΥ—ΣΕΒΟΜΕΝΟΥ, and prolonged the stroke at the top of the second Ι in ΤΙΙΟΥΣ, so as to make ΤΙΤΟΥΣ. But the conjecture is most improbable, for in this way he would have violated grammatical rule; and he was by no means ignorant of Greek construction.*

In connection with this reading it may be observed, that the translator has elsewhere blundered in Latin words. He did not know the language. Thus it is thought that he meant to express *custodia* or *custodes* by ܩܣܛܘܕܝܐ what is now Rish being a mistake for Dolath. Others take it for *questionarius* or *questionarii*.† We may also refer to *Forum Appii*, Acts xxviii. 15.

The paragraph in John's gospel relating to the adulteress does not belong to the version. Nor do we believe it was in the Greek text from which the version was derived, or that monachism in Syria had to do with its absence from the Peshito, as Wichelhaus supposes.

Luke xxii. 17, 18, are not in the version,‡ and accordingly they do not appear in the Vienna edition founded on MSS. Tremellius however *supplied* them; and Schaaf has inserted them without scruple in the text. Such conduct is highly reprehensible.

* See Hug, Einleit. vol. i. p. 302. † Comp. Wichelhaus, pp. 237, 238.
‡ Assemani Biblioth. Vat. vol. ii. p. 70.

In 1 Cor. v. 8, the version has, "but with the leaven of purity and sanctity," instead of "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

Here Adler* was wrong in charging the reading ܚܡܝܪܐ instead of ܦܛܝܪܐ upon the Nestorians, for both Nestorians and Jacobites have it. It is not confined to Nestorian MSS., but belongs to the Jacobite ones also. Moses of Mardin belonged to the Jacobites, and yet *he* had it in his MSS., and so it was printed in the Vienna edition. The Malabar MS. used by Dr. Lee also has it. Both parties too employ *fermented bread* in the east. Indeed it would appear that there is no authority for ܦܛܝܪܐ. All collated MSS. have the other; and those editions which put ܦܛܝܪܐ rest on no other foundation than conjecture.†

Hug does *not* say, in the *last* edition of his Introduction, that Adler found ܒܦܛܝܪܐ "in MSS. which according to the inscription were Nestorian."‡ *Neither* does Professor Lee in reply to Hug state that the preference given to the reading "with the leaven," by putting it in the text shews Jacobite MSS. to have been used.§ Such representations of the sentiments expressed by both critics are alike unfounded and untrue.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16 θεός is not found. The reading followed was either ὅς or ὅ, most probably the former.

We have now indicated the character of the version and the text at the basis of it with sufficient clearness to shew its utility in criticism. In weight and authority it surpasses any other version of the Greek Testament. Indeed there is no ancient translation either of the Old or New Testament which furnishes so much assistance in the criticism

* De Versionibus Syris, p. 39.

† Lee's Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglott, p. 44.

‡ See Einleit. vol. i. p. 328, fourth edition.

§ See Lee's Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglott, p. 44.

of the text. Its antiquity, its general fidelity, its accuracy, conspire to elevate it higher than any extant translation.

One caution must be particularly attended to in applying its text to critical purposes—a caution urged by Winer and Loehlein. We must pay regard to the construction of the language and the peculiar manner of the translator. There are deviations from the Greek, inversions, changes, which must not be construed into *peculiar readings*. They are rather *peculiarities of the version itself* than of the Greek text whence it was taken. Hence they should not be transferred to the latter.

This mistake is often made. Not to speak of many passages in which it is very pardonable because the distinction in them between *peculiarities of the version* and *various readings properly so called* is not easily made, the following have been absurdly adduced; and collators such as Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach and Scholz blamed for overlooking or omitting them in their critical apparatus! They belong simply to the translator, and do not at all partake of the character of *various readings.*

Matt. i. 24, "took her for his wife" is the literal rendering of the Syriac. But it must not be supposed that the translator had before him in the Greek text παρέλαβε αὐτὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

In Matt. ii. 11, the order of the three gifts in the Syriac is, *gold, and myrrh, and frankincense.* The sequence is changed by the translator in a thousand places.

Matt. iv. 1, instead of "by the Spirit," as in the Greek, the translator inserted the adjective *holy* before Spirit. Many adjectives he has arbitrarily inserted in other places. Again, in Matt. iv. 19, 21, the Syriac inserts *Jesus.* None however should think from this that the word *Jesus* was in the Greek. In Matt. iv. 24, a pronoun is *represented* in Syriac which is

merely *implied* in the Greek, viz. ܐܢܬܘܢ *ye*. But the translator must not be supposed on this account to have had ὑμεῖς in the Greek copy before him. He has taken far greater license than this in relation to pronouns.*

The extracts hitherto given from the version are still faulty and incomplete. But since the time Michaelis and Bode pointed out the faults of Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, fewer mistakes have been made.† Yet the editions of Griesbach and Scholz are not free from errors, as Loehlein has shewn; while *important* extracts might have been multiplied. What is most wanted is a new and critical edition from many more MSS. than have been yet employed or collated. There are very old and important copies in this country, brought from the Nitrian desert. These are sufficiently numerous and valuable to lay at the basis of a new edition, even without the assistance of such as are in the Vatican and other libraries of Europe. Michaelis's words are still true, that "in using this version we must never forget that our present editions are very imperfect, and not conclude that every reading of the Syriac printed text was the reading of the Greek MSS." when the version was made.‡

Let us now enumerate the chief printed editions.

1. In the year 1552 Ignatius, patriarch of the Maronites, sent a priest, Moses of Mardin, to Europe, to Pope Julius the Third, to make submission to the Roman See in the name of the Syrian church, and to bring with him *printed* copies of the New Testament. Moses could find none to undertake the work either at Rome or Venice, till at last Albert Widmanstadt, chancellor of Austria under Ferdinand I., prevailed upon the emperor to bear the expense. It was executed accordingly

* See Loehlein, p. 25, et seq.

† Curæ in versionem Syriacam Actuum Apostolicorum 1755; and Pseudocritica Millio-Bengeliana, 1767.

‡ Introduction to the New Testament by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 46.

by the joint labours of Moses, Widmanstadt, and W. Postell; and the whole was completed in 1555, Vienna, two volumes quarto. The first six lines of the title page are Syriac, in the Estrangelo character, the first four containing larger letters than the last two. They are followed immediately by the Latin translation, *Liber sacrosancti evangelii de Jesu Christo Domino et Deo nostro. Reliqua hoc codice comprehensa pagina proxima indicabit.* Under this is *Div. Ferdinandi Rom. imperatoris designati jussu et liberalitate, characteribus et lingua Syra Jesu Christo vernacula Divino ipsius ore consecrata, et a Joh. Evangelista Hebraica dicta, scriptorio Prelo diligenter expressa.* Then follows another line in the Estrangelo character, consisting of four words, with the Latin translation below, *principium sapientiae timor Domini.* Though the date is not on the title page, yet it may be found in other parts more than six times repeated. It is therefore inexcusable in Wichelhaus to give 1561 instead of 1555. Titles, dedications, and subscriptions are copiously interspersed throughout; in fact, before each gospel there is a leaf, on one side of which is a Syriac title, on the other a Latin translation of it. The work is handsomely printed in good, legible letters, and must be regarded as very accurate. Chapters and verses are not distinguished as in our present Greek editions, but our chapters are numbered in the margin in Arabic letters. The text is divided according to the reading lessons for the Sundays and festivals observed by the Syrian church, of which a list is given at the end of the book. The headings of these sections is in the Estrangelo character. It appears that there are 76 in Matthew, 43 in Mark, 75 in Luke, 53 in John.

The vowel points are not put everywhere. Many words have none. Many others have *some*, not *all*.

It should be observed, that the last two epistles of John, the second of Peter, the epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse are wanting.

Of the edition in question, a thousand copies were printed, of which the emperor reserved five hundred for sale, sent three hundred to the two Syrian patriarchs, and made a present of two hundred to Moses.

In some of the copies, on the reverse of the title page are the arms of the printer Zimmermann, with the subscription *cum Rom. Caes. Maj. gratia et privilegio cautum est, ut nemo deinceps hoc opus imprimat. Viennae Austriae excudebat Michael Zimmermann, Anno* MDLXII. Hirt* supposed that in this year the printer purchased from the emperor the remainder of the copies.

Besides the books which are wanting in this edition, because they are wanting in the genuine Peshito, the following passages are also absent:—(1.) The story of the adulteress, John vii. 53—viii. 1-11. (2.) 1 John v. 7.

Some words are also wanting in Matt. x. 8, and xxvii. 35. Luke xxii. 17, 18, are also absent. These three places however, together with John vii. 53—viii. 11, stand in the list of typographical errors at the end; and are marked with a star. They are properly various readings, not taken from Syriac, but from Greek or Latin MSS. It is likely, that as Moses of Mardin was a Jacobite, according to his own profession to Masius, and as his edition was prepared for the use of the Jacobites, being distributed into sections agreeably to the rites of the Jacobite church, Widmanstadt was afraid that the edition might get into disrepute on account of passages which differed from the Vulgate. Hence he put among *errata* what was wanting in the Syriac text compared with the Vulgate, or what was read in a different manner.†

* See his Oriental. und Exegetischer Bibliothek, Theil ii. p. 260, et seq ; iv. p. 317, et seq ; v. p. 25, et seq.

† "Propter pauca quaedam loca inter typographicas emendationes notata hoc signo, * in quibus libri Syrorum a nostris discrepant, vel ob historiam adulterae apud Johannem, quod et in Graecis exemplaribus non infrequens est, praetermissam, opus totum per calumniam ne reprehendito."—Widmanstadt.

We have very little information about the MSS. from which the text was taken. It would appear that Moses brought with him two MSS.* which Marsh thinks were not duplicates of the whole Syriac Testament, but only two different volumes, one containing the Gospels, the other the Acts and Epistles. But this is very uncertain. At the end of the Gospels Moses states in Syriac and Widmanstadt in Latin, that the edition was taken from two MSS.; one belonging to Moses, written at Mosul on the Tigris according to Masius, the other to Widmanstadt. Adler relates that the former is still in the Imperial Library at Vienna, marked cod. Lambecii 258. But this codex was written by Moses of Mardin himself, and is not an ancient one.† There is no doubt that good and ancient copies formed the basis of the edition, though they were in Jacobite hands. That they were Nestorian copies should not be asserted with Adler, who has made a mistake in attributing to the codices of the Nestorians alone, defects and peculiarities belonging to all the Syrian copies.

This *editio princeps* is most highly valued by every scholar, not merely because it is the first, but because its text is very accurate, being derived almost entirely from MS. authority. But Marsh's praise is extravagant when he says, "It may be considered as a perfect pattern of the genuine Peshito, which cannot be said of any subsequent edition."‡ It has become rare.

2. Tremellius, a converted Jew and professor at Heidelberg, edited a new edition of the Syriac Testament which appeared in 1569 folio, at Geneva, printed by Henry Stephens.

* Why Scrivener (Supplement to the authorised English version, vol. i. p. 64, Introduction) says that the edition was printed *from a single MS.* we are unable to say.

† See Wichelhaus, p. 217.

‡ Notes to Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii. pp. 537, 538.

The title page sufficiently explains its character. * The work is arranged in four columns, one page containing the Greek text and Beza's Latin translation; the other the Peshito printed in the Hebrew character, and a literal Latin translation of it by Tremellius himself. It detracted from the value of the work that for the want of Syriac type the learned editor was compelled to use the Hebrew letters. As he was accustomed to the Chaldee dialect, he made some slight changes so as to bring the Syriac into a closer conformity to the Chaldee. Thus instead of the letter *nun* which is prefixed to the third person of the future in Syriac, he put *yod*, out of conformity to the Chaldee language. Vowel points are regularly put to the text, all beneath it.

The basis of the text is the preceding edition of Widmanstadt. Besides this Tremellius had MSS. which he made use of to a considerable extent. Thus he often cites in the marginal notes a Heidelberg MS. which was subsequently carried to Rome with the Heidelberg library. He has also supplied the lacunae of the Vienna edition in Matt. xxiv. 17; John v. 20, vi. 39; Acts xxii. 11; Romans i. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 22, &c. and has corrected errata, ex. gr. in Matt. xiv. 3, xvi. 22; Acts iii. 5; Romans iii. 7, xv. 2; Heb. ii. 9. In other places he confesses that he could not correct, from his MS., the reading which he regarded as corrupt, Matt. vii. 23, xxii. 23; Acts v. 41; 1 Cor. xii. 23. The two columns in which the Syrian text and the Latin version of the narrative relating to the adulteress should stand are left vacant at that place with these words: *vacat haec pagina quod historia de*

* Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη Testamentum novum הַיְתִיקָא חַדְתָא. Est autem interpretatio Syriaca Novi Testamenti hebraeis typis descripta, plerisque etiam locis emendata. Eadem latino sermone reddita, Autore Immanuele Tremellio, theol. doctore et professore in schola Heidelbergensi, cujus etiam grammatica chaldaica et Syra calci operis adjecta est. Excudebat Henr. Stephanus. Anno M.D.LXI.X.

adultera in interpret. Syriaca non extet. In like manner the editor remarks in the margin at 1 John v. 7, that this verse is not found in the Syrian version and in many MSS. Bruns* has pointed out the rash alterations made in the text without MS. authority, such as Matt. x. 8, xxvii. 35; Luke xxii. 17, 18; Acts xv. 34.

The Syriac and Chaldee grammar at the end of the book occupies twenty-seven leaves.

The chief blame attached to the editor is that he was smitten with too great a desire of conforming the Syriac text to the Greek. His aim was not so much to present the text current among the ancient Syrians as to edit a Syriac or Chaldee version conformed to the original authentic Greek.

At the end of the work is a list of passages to which is prefixed the following superscription:—*Loci quidam in quorum scriptura partim peccarunt operae, partim codex Viennensis ex Heidelbergensi est emendandus*, ex. gr. Matt. xxvii. 20, ܕܢܫܪܐ ܠܗܘܢ Heid. ܕܢܫܐܠܘܢ item Raphel. et Guelpherb.

The edition is now scarce.†

3. The next edition is that contained in the fifth volume of the Antwerp Polyglott which issued from the Plantin press in 1572 in folio. Here the text is printed both in Syriac and Hebrew letters. The editor was Guido Fabricius or Guy Le Fevre de la Boderie; and the basis of the text is Widmanstadt's. According to the editor's own statement in the preface, he had one MS. which he compared and used:—"*Syrumque Novi Testamenti contextum a me litteris Hebraicis descriptum, diligenter recognovi, atque cum vetustissimo exemplari Syro, jam ab anno* 1500 *regni Alexandri* (1188), *a quo Syri annos suos numerant, manuscripto religiose contuli. Illud autem vetustissimum exemplar allatum fuerat ex Oriente a Postello.*"

* In the Repertorium für bibl. und morgenl. Literatur. Th. xv. p. 153.

† See Rosenmüller's Handbuch für die Literatur, u. s. w. vol. iii. p. 103, et seq.

The MS. in question has been identified by Marsh with the codex Coloniensis now in the University Library at Leyden, from which Rapheleng selected various readings appended to the editions of the Syriac Testament which proceeded from his press in 1575, 1583. But there is great reason for doubting the truth of this, since the MS. in question has many readings adapted to the Greek text and even the Latin Vulgate. Examples are given by Wichelhaus.* Fabricius added a Latin translation. The value of his edition cannot be very great, since the text was altered after the MS. mentioned.

4. In 1574 Plantin published in 8vo an edition of the Syriac in Hebrew letters, without points. It is the same text as in the Antwerp Polyglott, and has no title page of its own, the only superscription being ריתיקא חדתא printed over the first chapter of Matthew. In the text are not only the Syrian sections, but our present chapters, and in the margin the number of the separate verses. At the end are various readings collected by Francis Rapheleng from the cod. Coloniensis already mentioned.

5. In 1575 the same text, also printed in Hebrew letters, was issued in 16mo by Plantin, with Rapheleng's various readings.

6. The next edition is that of Paris, 1584 4to, promoted by Le Fevre. This contains the Greek text, the Vulgate, the Syriac, and a Latin version of it. The Syriac is written with Hebrew letters, but without points; and the Latin version is interlinear. Here the books and passages not belonging to the Peshito are omitted as in the preceding editions; but they stand in the Greek text and in the Vulgate columns. There is however an interpolation at the end of the epistle to the Romans.

7. The text of Elias Hutter in his edition of the New Testament in twelve languages, 1599, Nurnberg, folio, is of

* De Novi Testamenti versione Syriaca antiqua, &c. p. 219.

no use to the critic. The books wanting were here translated into Syriac.

8. Of more importance is the edition of Martin Trost, published at Cöthen in 1621 4to, in the Syriac character. It does not appear that the editor employed MSS., but he added a useful list of various readings gathered out of preceding editions. A list of readings in which the editions of Trost and Plantin differ from Widmanstadt, is given by Hirt.

9. In the ninth and tenth volumes of the Paris Polyglott we have the Peshito among other versions. Here it is reprinted from the Antwerp Polyglott. But the books which the version properly wants are also printed from the editions of De Dieu (the Apocalypse), and Pococke (the four Catholic epistles). Gabriel Sionita was the person who superintended the work ; and it is thought that he introduced various alterations and emendations. It was he that appended the vowel-points where they were not before, from his own judgment or from MSS. Michaelis has expressed a strong suspicion that the text was altered from mere conjecture ; at least many passages in the book of Revelation differ from the edition of De Dieu without any reason being assigned. Gabriel has been much blamed by Michaelis and others for his system of vowel-points, in the arrangement of which he has abided by strict analogy, whence modern grammarians have derived their rules. But this analogy may have been founded on the authority of MSS. It is by no means certain that it rested merely on his own conjecture. The researches of Wiseman have gone far to shew that he followed *ancient tradition.* And then it should be remembered that De Dieu's MS. of the Apocalypse had many blemishes, so that the departure of Gabriel's text from it may have been derived from the testimony of another MS.

10. From the Paris Polyglott the Peshito was transferred to the fifth volume of the London (1655). Although Walton says in his Prolegomena, after enumerating the defects of the

Paris edition, that he endeavoured to supply them all in his Polyglott, "*non ex propriis conjecturis sed secundum exemplaria MSS. quorum quaedam antiquissima, reliqua ex authenticis apud Syros codicibus descripta sunt;*" yet it may be doubted whether this language should not be restricted to the Old Testament. No MS. of the New Testament is mentioned. The story of the adulteress in John vii. 53—viii. 11 was added from a MS. belonging to Ussher, which however contains the Philoxenian or later Syriac version, not the Peshito, and where it is added in the margin. "The editors therefore of the London Polyglott have printed as a part of the Old Syriac version, a passage which is found only in the later copies of the New. It is wanting not only in the Peshito, but in the genuine copies of the Philoxenian, and was added in the latter as a marginal scholion, the translation being ascribed in Ridley's codex Barsalibaei to Mar Abba, in the Paris manuscript to one Paul a monk."*

The sixth volume contains the collection of various readings made by Trost. In this edition the example of the Paris editors was unhappily imitated in printing the four Catholic epistles which the genuine Peshito wants; and also the Apocalypse.

11. A better edition is that of Gutbier, Hamburg, 1664 8vo, who had two MSS. The basis of the text was that of Trost, but he also compared other editions. For the punctuation, which differs much from that of the Paris Polyglott, he appeals to the authority of a MS. borrowed from L'Empereur at Leyden. He inserted the narrative in John vii. 53—viii. 11 out of the London Polyglott, and 1 John v. 7 from Tremellius's translation of it into Syriac. These were serious blemishes. A glossary is appended; as also a collection of various readings from preceding editions, and critical notes containing examples of varying punctuation, &c.

12. Passing over other editions, we proceed to that pub-

* Notes to Michaelis's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 545.

lished at Rome for the use of the Maronites from the Propaganda press, in two folio volumes, Rome 1703. The first volume contains the gospels; the second, the Acts, Catholic and Pauline epistles. The book is a diglott, containing in two columns the Peshito text, and an Arabic version in Syrian characters, or *the Carshuni* text. The work was prepared under the editorship of Faustus Naironus Banensis Maronita, who gives an account of it in the preface. It would appear that the text is derived from a MS. belonging to the library of the College of Maronites. This MS. was a transcript made by Antonius Sionita in 1611, after three MSS. belonging to the College of Maronites. The four Catholic epistles as well as the Apocalypse are given in the very same text, with a few exceptions, as in the original editions of Pococke and De Dieu. Luke xxii. 17, 18, and the story of the adulteress are inserted, but marked with an asterisk at the beginning and end. Acts xxviii. 29, and 1 John v. 7 are wanting. In Acts xx. 28 the text has "the church of Christ." There is good reason for believing that the editor has introduced readings into the text *arbitrarily*, and *without authority*. An example of this occurs in Matt. xxvii. 35, where the words are taken from Widmanstadt's notes. Dr. Lee, who collated the fifth chapter of Matthew's gospel, has shewn that the text could not have been taken from ancient and accurate MSS. There are also many typographical errata. The vowel points too are *omitted* in many words, even in the case of proper names; and they are *inserted* according to no fixed rule.*

13. One of the best editions, which has found much and deserved favour is that published at Leyden in 1709 4to, by Schaaf and Leusden. The title is, *Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum Syriacum, cum versione Latina; cura et studio Johannis Leusden et Caroli Schaaf editum. Ad omnes editiones diligenter recensitum; et variis lectionibus magno labore*

* Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglott, p. 42.

collectis, adornatum. Lugduni Batavorum, &c. 1708 (or as more copies have) 1709.

Leusden died when the work had proceeded as far as Luke xv. 20. And as the two editors were of different sentiments in regard to the arrangement of the points, Schaaf, who had deferred to the judgment of the other, followed his own better judgment from Luke xviii. 27 to the end.

The text is chiefly taken from the Vienna edition, to which Schaaf joined the Paris and London Polyglotts, the punctuation being conformed to the latter. This is manifest from the preface, where we read:—"*Et ut haec nostra editio eo accuratior prodiret in publicum, ad omnes editiones, quotquot antea prodierant, diligentissime recensui. Et ex iis maximae utilitatis mihi fuere Viennensis, Parisiensis major, et Anglicana: Viennensis cum sit omnium prima et originaria, mihi primaria norma fuit.*" Thus the text is an *eclectic* one, formed from those of preceding editions without the assistance of MSS. The editor however was wrong in taking into the text from the editions of Tremellius and Trost such portions as are not in the oldest editions, as the four Catholic epistles already mentioned, and the Apocalypse; 1 John v. 7; John vii. 53—viii. 11. He has also interpolated in other places, as Acts viii. 37, xv. 34.

The text is divided into the ordinary chapters and verses, and the order of the books is that followed in the usual editions. It is beautifully and accurately printed, with a Latin version occupying a parallel column. As to the various readings at the end extending through one hundred pages, they are not of much importance, because they are all selected from printed editions, and not from MSS. The work is generally accompanied by Schaaf's *Lexicon Concordantiale*, in a similar quarto volume, which appeared at the same time and place, and leaves nothing to be desired as to completeness.

In 1717 was published a second edition at Leyden, at

least the title-page bears on it, "*Secunda editio a mendis purgata.*" But there is no doubt that it is the very same impression with the title-page a little altered, for the preface is dated like the other, 1708.

14. In 1816 another edition was published for the British and Foreign Bible Society, 4to, designed for distribution in the East, with the title in Latin, *Novum Testamentum Syriace denuo recognitum atque ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum emendatum.* On the opposite page is another title in the Estrangelo character.

This edition was superintended as far as the Acts of the Apostles by Dr. Buchanan, and completed by Dr. Lee. It was intended for the use of the Syrian Christians in the East.

According to Lee's own statement, printed in the notes to Wait's translation of Hug's Introduction, he used the following:

1. A MS. brought by Buchanan from Travancore, now deposited in the University Library at Cambridge. Dr. Lee thinks it 500 years old.

2. Another MS. in the same library, mentioned in Ridley's *Dissertatio de Syriacarum Novi Foederis Versionum indole*, &c. (p. 46.)

3. The collations of two ancient MSS. of the gospels in the Bodleian, published at Oxford by R. Jones, 1805 4to.

4. The collations contained in Ridley's dissertation, in the New Testament of Wetstein, and the edition of Schaaf.

5. The citations found in the works of Ephrem the Syrian.

6. A MS. belonging to Dr. A. Clarke, containing reading lessons.

The editor himself also states that along with these he had continual reference to other ancient versions and the Greek MSS. His own words are in another place:—"*Hoc tamen dixerim, nullam sane lectionem in textu hujus editionis reperiri posse, nisi quae et in codicibus ipsorum Syrorum reperiatur, bonitatisque suae speciem demum probabilem prae se ferat.*"*

* Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglott, p. 44.

The basis of the text is Schaaf's, and the vowel-points agree with the mode followed by that editor. The Greek vowels only are used. The points Ribui, the lineola occultans, Rucoch, and Kushoi are also employed. The text is divided into lessons, with headings in Syriac specifying the feast day or Sunday on which each is to be read according to the usage of the Jacobite Christians in Syria. Our chapters are also marked partly in the text and partly in the margin in Syriac numerals, while the common verses are noted in the margin in the ordinary numerals. There is no doubt that the text is very accurately printed.

In examining several prominent passages we find the following:—1 John v. 7 is wanting, and no note is given at the place. The story of the adulteress in John vii. 53—viii. 11, is given in the text, but between ruled lines, with a heading at the commencement, "This lesson respecting the sinful woman is not in the Peshito." To Matt. xxvii. 35, there is a note stating "in some Greek copies is added here" followed by ἵνα πληρωθῇ . . . . . κλῆρον in Syriac. Luke xxii. 17, 18, are put in a parenthesis. Acts viii. 37 is thrown into a note. Acts xv. 34 is put in a note. To Acts xviii. 6 is the note—"In Greek copies we find these words, 'your blood be upon your head.'" At Acts xx. 28 we have the note, "In other copies there is in this place, 'of the Messiah.'" Acts xxviii. 29 is put in a note. At 1 Cor. v. 8 there is this note, "In some copies there is in this place ܒܦܨܚܐ."

It has been shewn by Lee that the reading in his edition, and indeed in all others, viz. ܒܦܨܚܐ, is not a Nestorian reading exclusively, because the Jacobites as well as the Nestorians use fermented bread to the present day, as we learn from Asseman.*

Attention has been directed both by Hug and Lee to Heb. ii. 9, which has a characteristic reading of the Jaco-

* Prolegomena, &c. p. 44.

bites, according to the former critic. In Schaaf's edition, and as Hug states, in all printed editions and MSS. the reading is "for God himself by his grace tasted death for all." But in the edition before us, the words are "but he himself, by the grace of God, tasted death for all," and so it is in the Malabar MS. This agrees with the Greek, and shews no improper alteration of the original after the doctrinal tenets of the Jacobites. Dr. Lee has also alluded in particular to another reading which he deems of great moment. Acts xx. 28 "church of God," found in the Malabar MS., in the Bodleian (Dawk. 2), and in the Vatican one examined by Adler. Accordingly he has introduced it into the text of his edition; and without doubt it is ancient, having as good a claim to its place in the text as many readings in Widmanstadt's edition.

Various false statements have been made about this edition, such as, that the editor appeals to the Greek as authority; that his aim was not to give such an edition as would be valuable to the critic; that the readings have been derived in part from Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament; and that in the numbers and titles prefixed to the divisions or sections there are an incredible number of errors which have been rectified in some copies by printed pieces of paper pasted over the erroneous readings. We have the very best authority for saying, that such reckless assertions are *utterly untrue*. The editor does *not* appeal to the Greek as authority, nor was the Greek ever employed by him as such. No alteration was ever made on the authority of any Greek reading in any edition; nor was a single word changed without a preponderance of authority for it in the MSS. of the Syrians. The intention of the editor was also to give *to the Syrians a good and true copy of their text*, and therefore he rested on no single authority for any reading. Nor can any thing faulty be found in the readings at the heads of the sections. They

are very correctly printed; and the bits of pasted paper have nothing to do with their faulty character. The fact of the case is, that when the Bible Society thought of sending the edition to the Syrians of Mesopotamia as well as those of India, the editor suggested that the headings of their sections should be introduced for their convenience, for they mark the Sunday readings of their churches. The headings were faithfully inserted accordingly from the *editio princeps of Widmanstadt.* After a while however, some one *thought* he discovered various particulars stated in these headings savouring of heterodoxy, and therefore a person was employed to paste bits of paper over them all, as it would seem. But they are not at all faulty. They are connected with the rituals of the Syrians, and generally refer to some fast or festival of their church. Thus in Matt. i. 1—*The first day of the week before the nativity.* Verse 18. *The revelation of Joseph* (made to him). ii. 13. *The morning of the slaughter of the infants.* ii. 19. *The offering of the slaughter of the infants.* iii. 1. *The feast of the Epiphany.* iv. 1. *The first day of the week of the entering in of Lent and the offering of the forty* (days of Lent). Here is an error of the press in one letter ܩܘܪܩܐ for ܩܘܪܒܐ. iv. 12. *The first day of the week after the Epiphany.* On the whole, every possible care was taken by the editor to make the edition correct; and his labour was most successful. Conscious as he is of this, it is no wonder that he should affirm "It is very strange that I should thus be vilified by perfect and malicious falschoods."* But his text was highly esteemed and welcomed by such scholars as Gesenius and Roediger at Halle.

15. A later edition was published at London in 1828 12mo, by the Messrs. Bagster, under the editorial superintendence of Greenfield. The editor prefixed a brief Syriac preface containing at the end some account of the edition

* Private letter to the author.

itself. "This edition," says he, "has been printed from the Holy Scriptures in Syriac which were published by J. Albertus Widmanstadius and Moses Mardaeus and by L. De Dieu and E. Pococke. The points which are wanting in these editions have been supplied from the edition that was printed in London in 1816 above mentioned. From comparison with that edition many various readings have been procured, which are placed in a table at the end of the volume. But when a various reading was required to complete the sense or preserve the number of the verses, it has been thrown into its place and included in brackets like these, [ ]. These marks are also found in the passages which were defective in the Catholic epistles or in the Revelation of John, but were supplied by E. Pococke and L. De Dieu," &c.

Here we may remark that the editor does *not profess* to give *all* the various readings existing between his text and that of the Bible Society edition. Neither does he profess to enclose in brackets what is so enclosed in Lee's edition, nor to put either in the text or table at the end what the latter edition has in the text or in the notes. Hence no charge of inconsistency can be justly urged against him. He has done all that his preface proposes without falsifying any statement, or failing to do what is said to be done. And yet the memory of the learned editor has been injuriously assailed on this point—assailed however from ignorance. His preface has been mistranslated, and on the ground of such mistranslation he has been blamed for not strictly adhering to what he affirms!

It has only a Syriac title, partly in Estrangelo, and partly in the usual character.

This edition is peculiarly valuable as it enables us to see exactly the text of Widmanstadt. All additions to the text as there printed, are so marked as to be readily distinguished. We observe that 1 John v. 7 is put in brackets. So also

Acts viii. 37; xv. 35; xxviii. 29, are inserted in brackets. The editor has faithfully adhered to the statement made in his preface, as will be seen by comparing together what he really says with the table of various readings at the end, consisting of more than seventeen pages, the London edition of 1816, and Widmanstadt's. As a manual edition for the use of students, it surpasses any other modern one. The vowel points are the same as in that of 1816.

The following versions were made from the Peshito:—

1. An Arabic version of the Acts and Pauline epistles with 1 Peter, 1 John, and James. These were printed from a Leyden MS. and published by Erpenius at that place 1616 4to.

2. The Persian translation of the gospels contained in the fifth volume of the London Polyglott.

3. Adler found in the Vatican Library an Arabic paraphrase of some lessons taken from Paul's epistles written along with the Peshito, and taken from it. The codex is numbered xxiii. (Cod. Syr. Vat.); and Adler gave a specimen of it from the first epistle to the Corinthians with a Latin translation.*

In 1829 the British and Foreign Bible Society published an edition of the gospels, in quarto, for the use of the Nestorian Syrian churches in Mesopotamia. The title is, ܟܬܒܐ ܕܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ. The text was taken from one MS. only, which Wolff brought from the neighbourhood of Mosul. It was edited by T. Pell Platt, Esq. A new fount of type was made for this edition, imitating as nearly as may be the Nestorian Estrangelo handwriting. It has the headings of the several lessons according to the Nestorian ritual, many of them corresponding with those in Lee's edition of 1816, and is on the whole very correctly printed. We believe that the text has not been collated.

In 1848 the four gospels were printed from a Syriac MS.

* Adler's N. T. versiones Syriacae denuo examinatae, pp. 27-29.

in the British Museum by Rev. W. Cureton. The volume, which is in quarto, is entitled, "*Quatuor evangeliorum Syriace, recensionis antiquissimae, atque in occidente adhuc ignotae quod superest: e codice vetustissimo nitriensi eruit et vulgavit Guilielmus Cureton.*" An English translation with some account of the MS. is in preparation, and therefore the text, though *printed*, has not been published, for the learned editor intends to issue the whole together. The text of this edition differs considerably from the Peshito hitherto current, and there can be no doubt that it is taken from a very old source. The text is peculiar, and sometimes agrees with D. contrary to all ancient MSS. It shews as far as one MS. can do so the Greek text of an early period. The greater part of John is wanting. All that remains of Mark is only a few verses at the end of the gospel. Luke, which is fourth in order, is also defective; but not to the same extent as John. The Lord's prayer in Matthew has the doxology; though not exactly in the common Greek form. It is shorter here.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PHILOXENIAN VERSION.

Another Syriac version contains all the books of the New Testament except perhaps the Apocalypse, and is commonly called the Philoxenian or later Syriac, as distinguished from the Peshito or old Syriac. It is called *Philoxenian* from Philoxenus or Mar Xenayas, bishop of Hierapolis or Mabug in Syria from A.D. 488 to 518; at whose instigation the work was executed by Polycarp his rural bishop, in the year 508. It is difficult to discover the motive which prompted Philoxenus to procure the version in question. Ridley is of opinion that the great variety and corruption of the copies of the Peshito was the leading motive which led him to promote a new version.* This, as Michaelis has observed, is an unfounded supposition. More likely is the conjecture of Michaelis himself,† with which Bertholdt agrees, viz. that he wished to have a more literal version than the Peshito—one that should be an exact copy of the Greek text in Syriac, so that the original might be seen as nearly as possible in the vernacular language of the country. With this Michaelis unites another motive not so laudable, that Philoxenus hoped to promote the religious tenets of the Monophysite party to which he belonged, by obtaining new arguments from a new translation. The latter

* De Syriacarum Novi Foederis versionum indole atque usu, &c. Sectio x. p. 290, et seq. in Semler's Wetstenii Libelli ad Crisin, &c.

† Introduction to the New Testament by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 64.

motive is that by which Eichhorn and Hug believe him to have been influenced. He wanted, as they think, a church version for the purpose of advancing Monophysite doctrines, or at least of keeping himself and his party as distinct as he could from other sects. It is not likely that Philoxenus himself had a *critical* object in view, as Bertholdt believes.* More probable is it that his object was of a less commendable character; and that he meant the version in some way to subserve the advancement of his party.

In A.D. 616 it was revised by Thomas of Harclea or Harkel in Palestine, afterwards a monk of the monastery of Taril, and subsequently bishop of Mabug. The revision was made by Thomas in the monastery of the Antonians or monks of St. Anthony at Alexandria.

In the postscript to the gospels which most MSS. of the version have, it is said—"This is the book of the four holy evangelists which was turned out of the Greek language into Syriac with great diligence and much labour, first in the city of Mabug in the year 819 of Alexander of Macedon (508), in the days of the pious Mar Philoxenus, confessor, bishop of that city. But it was afterwards collated with much diligence by me, poor Thomas, by the help of two (other MSS. have *three*) highly approved and accurate Greek MSS., in Antonia, of the great city Alexandria, in the holy monastery of the Antonians. It was again written out and collated in the aforesaid place in the year 927 of the same Alexander (616), in the fourth indiction. How much toil and diligence I spent upon it (the book of the gospels) and its companions (the other books of the New Testament) the Lord alone knows, who will reward every man according to his works in his just and righteous judgment, in which may we be counted worthy of his mercy.—Amen."† Thomas

* Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 654.

† Translated from the postscript to the gospels printed from Ridley's MS. in White's edition, vol. ii. p. 561, et seq.

collated the Acts and Catholic epistles with one Greek MS., as the subscription to them relates. The Pauline epistles he collated with two; for two are cited in the margin, ex. gr. Philip. iii. 20; Eph. ii. 16; Romans viii. 27.

An important word, on which the history of the version greatly depends is ܬܘܒ in the preceding postscript, meaning *again*. According to Michaelis and Storr it means a *second collation* or revision. Eichhorn however explains it, *that is to say, the second time*, resuming thus what had been said in the previous context.* White translates it *Deinde*. One thing is tolerably clear, viz. that the edition of 616 made at Alexandria, did not proceed from an unknown editor, being different from a collation previously made by Thomas of Harkel, but that it proceeded from Thomas of Harkel himself; for Bar Hebraeus expressly states thus much. The editions of Thomas of Harkel and that of 616 are identical, contrary to what Michaelis believed.

In modern times, Bernstein propounded a new view, viz. that the Harclean revision was not the amended Philoxenian but another Syriac translation. For this he relies on the preface to the *Horreum Mysteriorum* of Gregory Bar Hebraeus where the words in point are, as he translates them,—"*et redditum est* (*N. T.*) *tertio Alexandriae opera pii Thomae Charklensis, in coenobio sancto Antonianorum.*" It is thus called *the third* from the Peshito, the Philoxenian or Polycarpian being *the second*. When therefore the word ܬܫܥܝܬܐ is applied, it means *edition* in the sense of *version*, because Bar Hebraeus calls it *the third* in reference to the two preceding *versions*. Besides these particulars, Bernstein refers to the marginal readings of a Vatican MS. described by Wiseman, (CLIII.) where the Karkaphensian monks cite a few passages from the Philoxenian version. As these places do not agree with the corresponding parts of the Philoxenian text printed by White,

* Einleitung, vol. iv. pp. 473, 474.

Bernstein concludes that *the true Philoxenian* is meant as it proceeded from Polycarp himself, and not the work made or revised by Thomas. He supposes that these are the only remaining fragments of the Philoxenian, which is but once alluded to by Bar Hebraeus in the preface to his Horreum Mysteriorum, is never quoted in the course of his commentary, and must therefore have been supplanted at that time by the text of Thomas.*

This reasoning, however plausible, will not bear examination. The postscript to the gospels already quoted plainly alludes to a *revision* of the Philoxenian by Thomas, not *another translation.* Gregory himself speaks less ambiguously in other places than he does in the preface to his *Horreum Mysteriorum* on which Bernstein relies. Thus, in a passage of his Chronicon, he says of Thomas, according to Bernstein's own Latin version,† *ut sacrum evangelii codicem ac reliquos Novi Testamenti libros* EMENDATIONE *valde probata et accurata correctos redderet post primam interpretationem*, &c.; and in another place, *Thomas Charklensis, qui primam Novi Testamenti* EMENDAVIT, *versionem quam (transtulit) condidit Mar Philoxenus Mabugensis, &c.* ‡ As to the five places not agreeing with White's printed edition, too much has been made of them. They are, Romans vi. 20; 1 Cor. i. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 13; 2 Cor. x. 4; Eph. vi. 12.§ The first differs by the transposition of a word; the second differs in one word; the third disagrees only in the vowel points; the fourth has ܠܐ ܗܘܘ for White's ܠܘ; the fifth changes one word for another. Surely these slight changes are not sufficient to justify or corroborate the opinion that the marginal readings of

* De Charklensi Novi Testamenti translatione Syriaca commentatio, pp. 3-10.

† Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. ii. p. 411, and Bernstein's Commentatio, p. 8.

‡ See Bernstein, ibid.

§ See Wiseman's Horae Syriacae, vol. i. pp. 178, 179.

the Vatican MS. and the edition printed by White represent *two versions*. The former are rather fragments of the Philoxenian before Thomas's revision; the latter Thomas's *recension* of the very same. They do not differ as independent translations.*

It is the work *as revised* by Thomas of Harkel that is extant, and has been printed. One MS. the codex Florentinus, containing no more than the four gospels which Adler examined and described,† has been thought to contain the original edition which proceeded from Polycarp himself, unrevised by Thomas of Harkel; but this is not certain. The text of it has not been printed.

The text of the Philoxenian as revised by Thomas is furnished with obeli and asterisks. Most of the MSS. too have critical remarks and readings in the margin.

In attempting to separate what belongs to Thomas from the original edition, there has been much conjecture. Indeed it is impossible to ascertain clearly what we owe to Polycarp and what to Thomas in the present text. The departments belonging to each cannot be certainly assigned to their respective authors. The marginal readings appended are mostly in Greek. Wetstein and White ascribed the critical signs, *i. e.* the obeli and asterisks, as well as the remarks in the margin, for the most part to Thomas. But this opinion was rejected, because a codex was found in the Medicean library at Florence which has not Thomas's subscription, and yet is furnished with these critical signs. It is believed by Adler and others that this codex is a copy of a MS. of the time antecedent to the labours of Thomas.‡ Hence the obeli and asterisks

* Comp. Hug. Einleit. vol. i. p. 341, et seq. fourth edition.

† Novi Testamenti versiones Syriacae, Simplex, Philoxeniana, et Hierosolymitana——denuo examinatae, &c. pp. 52-55.

‡ Crederem, codicem nostrum apographum esse antiquioris Philoxenianae versionis, a Thoma Harclensi nondum revisae et castigatae."—Adler, p. 55.

are as early as the time of Polycarp, author of the version. In this conclusion Storr, Hug, and De Wette, at least in part, concur.

What was the use of these signs? Here also there is much diversity of opinion. Do they mark the deviations of the new version from the Peshito? so thought Wetstein, Storr, Eichhorn, and Griesbach. Or were they designed to shew the difference between the Philoxenian text and the Greek MSS. with which it was collated? So thought White and Bertholdt. The latter is supported by many examples which White adduces. The former opinion is favoured by various examples produced by Storr, such as Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 19, xi. 10, &c. But neither the one nor the other view can be held exclusively, for examples support sometimes the one and sometimes the other. Hence we must believe that the marks in question did not all proceed from one person at one time, but from two or more who had different objects in putting them; or else that the one person had no *one* object in view, but affixed them for different purposes; which however is improbable.

With regard to the various readings and notes in the margin, Storr and Eichhorn assign them in part to Polycarp; but Hug and Bertholdt to Thomas alone. In favour of the latter view, the fact of the Medicean MS. at Florence wanting all such marginal notes has been adduced.

We cannot agree with those who hold that the critical signs were altogether prior to Thomas. They belonged to Polycarp in part; but some proceeded from Thomas. Too much stress has been laid by Hug on the Florentine MS. having them, as if they could not have been put into it by a copyist from a MS. subsequent to Thomas. Neither do we believe that the marginal readings and notes proceeded wholly from Thomas. The fact that they are not in the same Medicean MS. is no proof that they did not proceed from Polycarp; for a tran-

scriber may have omitted them, though he followed a copy of Thomas's revised edition. Hug adduces the marginal annotation to Mark xi. 10 as a proof that Thomas was the author of such notes.* In the text of this place, after πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβίδ follows an asterisk with the words εἰρήνη ἐν οὐράνῳ καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, and in the margin, "*non in omnibus exemplaribus Graecis invenitur, neque in illo Mar Xenajae; in nonullis autem accuratis, ut putamus, invenimus.*" But Thomas collated Alexandrine MSS.; and it is very unlikely that he had a MS. of Xenayas's. Hence the annotation seems to belong to Polycarp.

The character of this version, which was based on the old Syriac, is *extreme literality*. It was the desire and endeavour of the translator that not a syllable of the original should be lost. Hence the Syriac idiom has been often sacrificed through rigid adherence to the original Greek. Greek words are used; even the Greek cases appear; the Greek article is imitated by pronouns; Greek etymology is represented; and Greek constructions are not unusual. Oriental proper names are also written according to the Greek orthography in a manner which destroys their Oriental etymology. In consequence of this slavish adherence to the minutiae of the original, the style is much inferior to that of the old Syriac. But the critical use of the version is greater in proportion to its literality. If we had it as originally made by Polycarp, apart from Thomas's emendations, it would be much more valuable. Judging by the Florentine MS., the corrections made by Thomas were neither numerous nor important. Adler says of this MS., *contextus ab Harclensi recensione parum differre videtur.* It is wholly improbable that he made *extensive* alterations in the Philoxenian document, thereby making a new *version* rather than a *recension* of the text. All the phenomena are against that hypothesis. And if Polycarp himself had used

* Einleit. vol. i. pp. 335, 336, fourth edition.

Greek MSS. only, without the adoption of words and phrases belonging to a version or versions previously existing, his work would have been of greater importance. But as it was based on the Peshito, and underwent a revision by Thomas of Harkel a century after it was executed, the value is diminished. Yet it has its use notwithstanding. It exhibits ancient readings entitled to attention. What is most to be regretted is the present state of the text; for the critical signs have in many cases been dropped; the readings of the text have got into the margin; and those of the margin into the text. Such confusion tends to make a critic cautious in the employment of it.

The marginal readings are perhaps the most valuable part. One of the two Greek MSS. which Thomas compared with the Greek text had considerable affinity to the Cambridge MS. in the gospels and Acts. According to Adler's computation, the marginal readings in the gospels coincide with the Cambridge MS. alone 19 times, with the Cambridge and Vatican 6 times, 25 times with the Cambridge and several MSS. Of 180 marginal readings, 130 are found in B. C. D. L. 1, 33, 69, &c. Hence their text belongs to the western class.*

If the preceding account of the Philoxenian be correct, it is easy to see how much the summary statement of it given by Scrivener is apt to mislead: "It (the Philoxenian Syriac) is in truth nothing but the result of a close collation of the Peshito with two Greek MSS. of about the fifth century."†

The first notice of this version in modern times proceeded from Asseman. A more circumstantial account of it was afterwards presented to the public by Wetstein, who collated a MS. of it belonging to Glocester Ridley. The latter had received it and another from Amida (Diarbekr). But Wetstein's collation was necessarily imperfect, as he only spent fourteen days over the MS. Ridley himself, at the request of Michaelis,

* De verss. Syriacis, pp. 79-133, especially pp. 130, 131, 132.

† Supplement to the authorised English version, introduction, p. 68.

afterwards published an important essay in which he described the version with the two copies of it in his possession, and corrected the mistakes of Wetstein and Michaelis.* Some years after, Storr discovered MSS. of the version at Paris, and wrote a treatise containing additional information about it.† Six years after Storr's essay, Ridley's MSS., which were deposited in the library of New College, Oxford, were intrusted to Professor White that he might *publish* the version; and it appeared accordingly in parts at different times.‡ Professor Adler contributed still farther to our acquaintance with the version and MSS. of it by his *Biblico-critical travels*, and his essay already mentioned. He examined MSS. at Rome and Florence, describing one in the latter place which is *supposed* to be peculiarly important as exhibiting the version before it was revised by Thomas. Since the treatises of these critics and the publication of the work itself, nothing has been added to our real knowledge of the version.

It is somewhat remarkable that none of the MSS. contains any more than the four gospels except White's *Codex Harclensis* from which the version was chiefly printed. At least none in Europe is known to possess any more books. Even the *cod. Harclensis* is imperfect. It wants the last part of the epistle to the Hebrews, from the twenty-seventh verse of the eleventh chapter till the end. It also wants the Apocalypse.

* De Syriacarum Novi Foederis versionum indole atque usu Dissertatio: Philoxenianam cum Simplici e duobus pervetustis codd. MSS. ab Amida transmissis conferente Glocestro Ridley, 4to, 1761.

† Observationes super N. T. versionibus Syriacis, 8vo, 1772.

‡ Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana, ex codd. MSS. Ridleianis in Biblioth. Coll. Novi Oxoniensis repositis, nunc primum edita cum interpretatione et annotationibus Josephi White, &c. &c. 4to, 1778, Tom. i. and ii. Actuum Apostolorum et Epistolarum tam catholicarum quam Paulinarum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana, ex codice MS. Ridleiano, &c. &c. Tom. i. Actus Apostolorum et epistolas catholicas complectens 4to, 1799. Tom ii. epistolas Paulinas complectens, 4to, 1803.

But here a question arises, had the Philoxenian ever the Apocalypse? In some editions of the Peshito, as that of Leusden and Schaaf, there is a version of the Apocalypse which does not belong to the old Syriac. But its internal character agrees with the Philoxenian as revised by Thomas. This book was first printed by De Dieu from a MS. in the University of Leyden which formerly belonged to Joseph Scaliger, whence it was afterwards incorporated into the Paris and London Polyglotts. It is very likely that it is the Apocalypse of Philoxenus, though not found in any of the MSS. of his version yet discovered. In minute peculiarities it coincides with the Philoxenian. Thus it frequently admits Greek words, imitates the Greek text in the representation of the article itself, chooses the same Syriac words as in other parts for the same Greek words. A good example may be seen in Rev. i. 4-6, where the Greek text is closely imitated, and every part of the Greek article expressed by ܗܠܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܗܝ ܗܘ, &c. There are, it is true, some exceptions to the rule that the same words and phrases are similarly rendered in the Philoxenian and this of the Apocalypse, but they do not invalidate the general principle. Even the critical marks of the Philoxenian seem not to have been wanting in the Apocalypse, for though the printed text has not been derived from a MS. furnished with them, yet the fragment of the Florentine MS. which Adler* printed (Apocalypse i. 1-2) has an asterisk at the end of it.†

This view is confirmed by the fact that the subscription to a Florentine MS. of the Apocalypse speaks of the codex being copied from a very old autograph, belonging, according to report, to Thomas of Harkel himself, and written in 622.‡

* De verss. Syriacis, p. 78.

† See Eichhorn's Einleitung, vol. iv. p. 461, et seq.

‡ Codex anno 1582 Romae descriptus ab autographo pervetusto, ab ipso, ut perhibetur, Thoma Heracleensi exarato, anno 622.—Ridley de Syriacarum, &c. p. 46.

CHAPTER XII.

OTHER SYRIAC VERSIONS.

A SYRIAC VERSION OF THE FOUR CATHOLIC EPISTLES WHICH WERE NOT RECOGNISED AS CANONICAL BY THE EARLY SYRIAN CHURCH.

It is remarked by Cosmas Indicopleustes, in the sixth century, that only three catholic epistles, one of James, one of Peter, and one of John were found among the Syrians.*

Dionysius Bar Salibi (1166-1171) bishop of Amida, in the twelfth century,† relates in the preface to his commentary on the second epistle of Peter, "that this epistle had not been translated into Syriac with the Scriptures in old times, and was therefore found only in the version of Thomas of Harkel."‡

Two different texts of a Syriac translation of the four catholic epistles which the Peshito wants were first made known by Pococke—one complete, the other only fragmentary. The first was printed from a Bodleian MS. (which contained the Acts and the three catholic epistles of the Peshito); the

* In Galland. biblioth. Patrum, vol. xi. p. 535.

† See Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. ii. p. 156.

‡ See praefat. to Pococke's "Epistolae quatuor, Petri secunda, Johannis secunda et tertia, et Judae, fratris Jacobi una, ex celeberr. Bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxon. exemplari nunc primum depromptae, &c. &c. opera et studio Eduardi Pocockii, &c. Lugd. Bat. 1630, 4to."

second was gathered out of the commentary of Dionysius Bar Salibi. The Philoxenian version too contains these four catholic epistles. But these three Syrian texts resolve themselves into two; for that explained by Dionysius in his commentary agrees with White's Philoxenian, and must be considered identical with it. Hence the four epistles absent from the Peshito are extant in no more than two Syrian texts, those of Pococke and White.

The two texts in question bear decided marks of separation from the manner of the Peshito. They are inferior in purity, clearness, and elegance of diction. And when compared with one another they appear to be formed on the same basis, but evincing a striving after literality in different ways.

In regard to the origin of Pococke's text, we have no historical accounts. Hence criticism can only proceed to draw a conclusion respecting it by comparing it with the Philoxenian. There is no essential difference between them. The general character of both is the same. Their uniform tenor is alike. And in words they agree so often that the verbal diversity is the exception rather than the rule. They deviate from each other only in that which the reviser of a particular version would look upon as an improvement. The text of White adheres to the Greek words more slavishly than that of Pococke, which was doubtless reckoned a great excellence in the fifth century. Hence the suggestion naturally arises that the former may possibly have been but the revised edition of an earlier Syrian translation, in which the chief object was to remove every thing supposed not to represent the original accurately. Accordingly, we suppose that the text of White was the Philoxenian revised by Thomas of Harkel, and made more literal; while that of Pococke was the same Philoxenian *before* its alteration by Thomas.

To shew that both texts represent one and the same version, we may refer to the version of *ἰσότιμος πίστις* in 2 Peter i. 1.

In Pococke's text the sense is somewhat obscurely expressed; in White's it is clearer and more conformed to the Greek. Verse 3, both render ἀρετή by the same Syriac noun, but Thomas added another for the purpose of exhausting its meaning. Verse 6, both translate ἐγκράτεια by the one word. In verse 10 both have the reading "your good works," but each expresses the phrase characteristically. Compare also verses 12, 15.

Yet Thomas of Harkel could not follow the earlier work without alterations. Existing versions did not satisfy the taste of his time, because they appeared to indulge in too much freedom. Hence he altered the Philoxenian—already literal enough—where he thought it departed too far from the Greek text either in the choice or position of words. This might be abundantly testified by examples. We must content ourselves with a bare reference to the following:—2 Peter i. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19.*

The result of this comparison makes it highly probable, that of the four catholic epistles which the Peshito wants, we possess the Philoxenian version in two exemplars, one exhibiting its original condition as it came from the hands of Polycarp, and one after it had been revised by Thomas of Harkel.

It should be recollected here, that Polycarp, in the case of these four catholic epistles, had no Peshito before him, but was left to his own abilities and obliged to work at the translation independently. But Thomas of Harkel had the assistance of Greek MSS.

In Eichhorn's Introduction, the text of 2 Peter i. 5-10 is printed in three parallel columns—first, the Greek; secondly, the Syriac of Pococke; thirdly, that of White, with critical notes, giving a very convenient specimen for the purpose of mutual comparison.

Nothing could be more absurd, or betray greater ignorance

* Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. iv. p. 450, et seq.

of antiquity, as well as of the reasonings and opinions of such critics as Eichhorn and De Wette, than the conjecture that the Nestorians made this version of the four catholic epistles wanting in the Peshito, that they might not be behind their rival party the Monophysites, who had the Philoxenian. The version is certainly not recent, being the Philoxenian in its first condition; and although it is not so very literal as the revised text by Thomas of Harkel, it is equally valuable, if not more so, for critical purposes.

Since Pococke first printed it in the Hebrew character, it has been repeatedly reprinted in the proper Syriac character, as in the Paris and London Polyglotts, the editions of Gutbier, Schaaf, the London Bible Society, &c. &c.

Of the text of the Apocalypse, first printed by De Dieu, we have already spoken, as belonging to *the Philoxenian version revised* by Thomas of Harkel. All the probabilities at least are in favour of this view. It has been also reprinted in the same editions of the Peshito as contain the four catholic epistles to which we have just alluded.*

JERUSALEM SYRIAC VERSION.

This version was first described by Asseman in his catalogue of the Vatican library, but slightly. It was fully described by Professor Adler about the middle of the last century, from the only MS. of it yet known, belonging to the Vatican, No. 19, consisting of 196 thick parchment leaves, in quarto. It is an Evangelistarium, containing nothing more than lessons from the gospels adapted to the Sundays and festivals throughout the year in the Syrian churches. The subscription states that the MS. was written in a monastery at Antioch 1030. *The character* in which it is written approaches the Hebrew, and has this peculiarity, that *Dolath* and *Rish*

* See De Wette's Einleitung, pp. 12, 13.

were not at first distinguished by a critical point; the points they have now having been put by a later hand. Two figures are also used for P. and F., though they are represented by one in the Syrian alphabet.

The dialect resembles the Chaldee as spoken at Jerusalem. Hence words frequently occur which are usual in the Jerusalem Talmud. The grammar of the translator also approaches the Chaldee. Thus we find the suffixes of the third person in plural nouns the same as in Chaldee, ܘܢ instead of the Syriac ܘܗܢ; the emphatic state terminating in ܝܐ *aya*, whereas in Syriac it is ܐ, *e*, &c. &c.*

From internal evidence it is manifest that the version was made from the Greek, because there is sometimes an endeavour to express Greek etymologies. Greek words are also retained. But there is not that slavish literality observable in the Philoxenian. The translation is freer, occupying an intermediate character between the Peshito and Philoxenian.

The Greek text which it represents bears the impress of a high antiquity. Hence it approaches to that of the Peshito and western class, to the MSS. D. and B. Of 165 readings which it has, 79 are found in the Cambridge MS., of which 11 are peculiar to it; 85 in the Vatican, of which 3 are peculiar to it. On the whole its readings agree most with the class of MSS. B. C. D. L. 1-13, 33, 69, &c., and with the citations of Origen and Chrysostom. But it cannot be said to belong to either class of critical authorities, nor is its text made up of a mixture of both.†

The relation which the version bears to some of the oldest and best documents sufficiently attests the antiquity and value of the text that lies at the basis of it. It is true that Adler found in it upwards of seventy singular readings where no Greek MS. coincides; but this demands no special attention,

* See Adler, pp. 137-140.

† See Adler, de verss. Syr. pp. 198-201.

because they might be mistakes of the transcriber, or the results of translating too freely.*

In Luke xxiii. 44, καὶ σκότος————ἐνάτης is omitted. Here the version stands alone, and is probably right. It seems in like manner to exhibit the true reading, along with a few other witnesses, in Matt. i. 11, ii. 18, v. 47, vi. 1, viii. 13, 31, xix. 29, xxi. 29; Luke vii. 28. Some corrections seem to be in it, such as Matt. vi. 6, where a second hand added improperly ἐν τῷ φανερῷ. In xxi. 7, we have the correction ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὸν πῶλον, which is also in the Peshito and Persian. So too ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Matt. xxii. 43; ἀποθνήσκουσα for καὶ αὕτη απέθνησκεν, Luke viii. 42. In Luke xvi. 21, it has in the margin the same addition which is in the Vulgate; and in Luke xvi. 22, and John vi. 58, something is added in the margin. Hence we suppose that it underwent subsequent revision.†

It is worthy of remark that the story of the adulteress, though wanting in the old Syriac and Philoxenian, occurs in this version almost in the same form in which it appears in D. or the Cambridge MS.

Hug has endeavoured to determine with greater definiteness than others, the part of Syria in which the version originated. He thinks that it was in a Roman province, because soldiers are simply called ܪܘܡܝ *Romans*, Matt. xvii. 27, and in the same verse σπεῖρα is translated ܩܣܛܪܘܢ *castra* (quaestores?). Idioms also occur in it which are found only in the Philoxenian, and therefore it is inferred that the countries where they originated respectively must be contiguous.‡ On the whole Palestine has the best claim to be the birthplace of it. Hence it has been called Palestino-Syriac.

In regard to its age, Adler assigns it to the fourth century, Scholz to the fifth. A few Latin words however which occur

* See Adler's N. T. versiones Syriacae, &c. p. 198.

† See Rinck's Lucubratio Critica, p. 241.

‡ Einleitung, vol. i. pp. 345, 346.

here and there create some difficulty in fixing upon so early a date. These Latin words were probably not taken by the Jews into their language before the sixth century, and some of them may have proceeded from a later hand. Adler himself is not indisposed to bring it down later, and to put it between the fourth and sixth centuries.* Probably Scholz's opinion is nearly correct.

Adler, to whom we owe all our knowledge of it, has given a correct description of the MS. and its contents in his valuable treatise on Syriac versions. He has also printed, by way of specimen, Matt. xxvii. 3-32. Eichhorn has reprinted and commented on the same portion.†

* See p. 202.

† Einleitung in das neue Testament, vol. iv. p. 493, et seq.

CHAPTER XIII.

ÆTHIOPIC AND EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

ÆTHIOPIC.

The Æthiopic language is an early branch of the Arabic; and our existing version of the Scriptures in it was made throughout from the Greek. But the time *when* it was made cannot be discovered either by express historical testimony, or by an investigation of probable grounds. Chrysostom boasts that the religious books of the Christians had been translated into the dialects of nations the most diverse; and specifies among them the Syrians and Egyptians, the Jews, Persians, and Æthiopians; but we are scarcely justified in attaching much significance to this language. The eloquent father speaks in the hyperbolical, exaggerated strain of the orator, rather than in the sober tone of truth and reality. The Greek passage need not be quoted, as it may be found in Marsh's Michaelis, where the learned translator observes that Chrysostom has weakened his own evidence by the addition of the clause *καὶ μύρια ἕτερα ἔθνη*.*

Frumentius, who first preached Christianity among the Æthiopians, and is mentioned by Athanasius in his apology to the Emperor Constantius, is commonly supposed to be

* See Opp. ed. Montfaucon, vol. viii. p. 10.

the author of an Æthiopic version. If this be true, the Scriptures were translated by him towards the close of the fourth century. This however is mere hypothesis. The first preacher of the gospel among a foreign people may not be capable of translating the records of religion into their native tongue. He may not even have the leisure necessary for that purpose, supposing him fit for the task. Centuries may elapse before a competent person be found for the work. Hence the connexion between Frumentius and the translator of the Bible into Æthiopic is very slender. It is perhaps more likely that he was not the translator, than the contrary. The Abyssinians, as we are informed by Ludolf,* mention with particular honour among their first preachers of Christianity one Abba Salama, to whom a native poet and an Æthiopic martyrology ascribe the translation of the books of the law and gospel from *the Arabic*, into the native language. But this is very questionable; at least the present version was not the one alluded to, as it was made from the original.

The present translation, or the one said to have been made by Frumentius, was composed in the Geez dialect, according to Bruce. But that is the dialect of the learned, which would scarcely have been chosen for the benefit of the common people. The version is in the ancient dialect of Axum, which afterwards gave way to the Amharic, when another dynasty mounted the throne.

It is manifest that the Æthiopic version was taken from the original Greek. The mistakes it presents could only have arisen from the Greek, as ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλών, *in monte Zabulon*, Matt. iv. 13; πέδαις φυλασσόμενος, *a parvulis custoditus*, Luke viii. 29; προκεχειρισμένον, *quem praeunxit*, Acts iii. 20, as if it had been προκεχρισμένον; κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ, *aperti sunt quoad*

* Historia Æthiopica, Lib. iii. c. 2. and Commentarius in histor. Æthiop. Ad. Lib. iii. c. 4. p. 295.

animum, Acts ii. 37, where the verb was mistaken for κατηνοίχθησαν; οὓς μὲν ἔθετο, *aurem posuit ecclesiae*, 1 Cor. xii. 28, where there was a mistake for οὓς μέν, &c. *

In consequence of the agreement of the Æthiopic with the Coptic, Bengel conjectured that it was derived from the latter. This however is baseless. Proofs of it are superfluous since C. B. Michaelis entered fully into the subject, and shewed by numerous examples that there is frequent disagreement between the two versions. †

The critical peculiarities of the text are not easily discovered or described. And what renders this fact more apparent, or probably contributes to it in no small degree, is the faulty way in which the text has been printed. In general, it frequently agrees with the Cambridge MS. (D.) and the old Latin, shewing glosses and interpolations similar to those found in these ancient documents. Hence those critics who hold various revisions of the text in the middle of the third century, would say that the version is derived directly or indirectly from the old unrevised text. As might be expected, it agrees most with the western class in its two families, the African and Latin. It is vain to attempt a more minute investigation, as Hug has done; for nothing is gained by conjectures. Thus he says, that the text of the four gospels does not adhere constantly to any class of MSS. ‡ Neither does the text of any existing version. And when the same writer affirms that several versions are combined in this one copy, or else several MSS. of different recensions were used in the composition of it, the assertion is very improbable. The translator or translators used such MSS. as they could procure most easily. They employed Alexandrine copies. Their text was that which then prevailed at Alexandria. This indeed is admitted by Hug except in relation

* See Hug's Einleit. vol. i. p. 377; and Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. v. p. 68.

† De variis N. T. lectionibus, § 26. ‡ Einleit. vol. i. p. 376.

to the gospels, where he maintains that the text flowed from various constituent sources, Asiatic and Alexandrine.

The book of Acts is most incorrectly edited. Those who first published the version at Rome had a very imperfect copy of it, and were obliged in not a few instances to translate from the Vulgate into Æthiopic to supply deficiencies. This is admitted by themselves. In the preface they say:—"Ista acta apostolorum maximam partem Romae translata sunt e lingua Latina et Graeca in Æthiopicam propter defectum protographi."* Is the suspicion quite unfounded, that the Vulgate was consulted in other cases besides the Acts?

A few examples will shew the agreement of the text in this version with D., the old Latin, the Vulgate, and also with Clement and Origen.

Matt. vii. 1, *αντιμετρηθήσεται.* The Æthiopic, Origen, B. L. and important MSS. of the Vulgate have *μετρηθήσεται.* Matt. ix. 24, *λέγει αὐτοῖς ἀναχωρεῖτε.* The Æthiopic, old Latin, Vulgate, D. B., have *ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* &c. Acts i. 23, *βαρσαβᾶν.* Æthiopic, D., and some other authorities, *βαρνάβαν;* John i. 18, *μονογενὴς υἱός;* the Æthiopic, Clement twice, Origen twice, the Syriac, B. L., and a considerable number of weighty authorities, have *θεός;* John i. 42, *πρῶτος;* the Æthiopic, old Latin, Vulgate, both Syriac, A. M. X. &c., have *πρῶτον;* Eph. vi. 12, *τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; τοῦ αἰῶνος* is omitted by the Æthiopic, old Latin, Vulgate, Clement, Origen, and many ancient authorities.†

The version was first published at Rome by three Æthiopians in two volumes 4to, 1548-49. This was reprinted in the London Polyglott, but without improvement, 1657 folio, with a Latin version by Dudley Loftus, under the care of Edmund Castell. The edition of 1698 is the same with a new date and title page. In 1753-55 Bode, who gave more

* See Ludolf's Commentarius, &c. p. 297.

† See Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. v. pp. 72, 73; and De Wette, Einleit. fifth edition, pp. 20, 21.

attention to the version than any preceding scholar, published a Latin translation in two volumes 4to at Brunswick. He also published his Pseudo-critica Millio-Bengeliana, Halle 1767, 1769, 2 vols. 8vo, in which he corrected many errors of Bengel and Mill.

In his history of Æthiopia, Ludolf gave a list of the Æthiopic MSS. found in the libraries of Europe in his day.

Some years ago, an entire copy of the Æthiopic Scriptures was purchased by the Church Missionary Society. This MS. was carefully transcribed and the four gospels published in 1826 4to, by T. Pell Platt, Esq. with the title; "Evangelia Sancta Æthiopica. Ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem edidit Thomas Pell Platt, A. M. Londini 1826, 4to." The whole New Testament was completed by the same scholar and published in 1830. Unfortunately this text has not yet been collated and employed in any critical edition. Mr. Platt also published a "Catalogue of the Æthiopic Biblical MSS. in the Royal Library of Paris, and in the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society," 4to, London 1823.

EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

After the death of Alexander the Great, the Greeks multiplied in Egypt and obtained important places of trust near the throne of the Ptolemies. The Greek language began to diffuse itself from the court among the people, and the Egyptian was either excluded, or obliged to adapt itself to the Greek both in forms of construction and the adoption of new words. In this manner arose the Coptic, a mixture of the old native Egyptian and the Greek, so called from Coptos the principal city in upper Egypt. When the race of the Ptolemies became extinct, this language acquired greater esteem and authority; the Greek which had been forcibly introduced by foreigners, naturally declining with the waning influence of those whose

vernacular dialect it was. It would appear that the Coptic established itself in upper Egypt sooner and more extensively than in the lower division of the country, not only because the Greeks were much more numerous at Alexandria, but because of the commerce carried on by its inhabitants with nations speaking the Greek language.

As soon as the Egyptian or Coptic had displaced the Greek, the necessity of a version of the Bible would be felt by the Christians, in the current language of the country. The disuse of Greek led to a demand for the Coptic Scriptures.

At what time Egyptian versions first appeared cannot be ascertained with exactness. It is tolerably clear that they existed in the fourth century. One bishop at least who did not know Greek, was at the council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). The services and liturgy of the churches must have been in Coptic if not solely, yet not in Greek without the native tongue also. In proof of this a passage from an old Coptic glossary has been produced by Renaudot,* and a very ancient fragment of John, belonging to the fourth century published by Georgi. Besides, the monkish rules, as those of Pachomius, enjoined the reading of the Scriptures and Psalter, which must have been in the language then spoken. Thus, says Hug, in the fourth century Egyptian versions of the New Testament were current in Nitria, in the Thebaid, in the Arsinoitic nome, in upper, lower, and middle Egypt.†

But this is not their earliest existence. Probably the first were made in the latter half of the third century, if there be any weight in the particulars mentioned by Hug, viz. that in the Diocletian persecution the praetor visited upper Egypt in search of Christians, and when one voluntarily gave himself up he was tried through an interpreter and sentenced to death; that Hieracas of Leonto about the close of the third century

* Liturg. Orient. collectio, vol. i. p. 205.

† Einleitung, vol. i. p. 362.

composed a treatise on the works of the six days presupposing a version of the Mosaic writings.

There were two principal dialects of the Egyptian or Coptic language, viz. the Thebaic or Sahidic, and Memphitic. The former was the dialect of upper Egypt; the latter that of the lower country.

1. *Sahidic* or *Thebaic.*

Only fragments and readings of this version have been published. Hence it has afforded comparatively little aid to the restoration of the primitive text, though its value and antiquity are such as entitle it to great weight, wherever its testimony is fairly known. But till it be fully and correctly published by a competent scholar, criticism must be contented with using the parts that are accessible. Woide was the first who gave to the public a few specimens of the Sahidic version of the gospels, consisting in mere readings. They were printed in J. A. Cramer's Beiträge or *contributions* to the theological and other sciences, in 1779. Shortly after, Mingarelli published the text of some fragments of the gospels found in the library of Chevalier Nani, 1785. These are Matt. xviii. 21—xxi. 15. John ix. 17—xv. 1. Georgi also published some fragments of John's gospel found in the library of Cardinal Borgia, having by the side of the Sahidic the Greek text in uncial letters, 1789. They contain John vi. 21-59, vi. 68—viii. 23. Woide still continued to collect readings of the epistles which he had commenced with the contribution already mentioned. He sent to Michaelis, who published them in his *Oriental Library*, readings out of the Acts from a MS. in the Bodleian containing the Acts in this version, and readings in the epistles of John and Jude. Münter also published some fragments of the Pauline epistles from MSS. in the possession of Borgia, 1789. Woide did not cease gathering fragments of the version from all quarters, for the purpose of procuring a complete copy of the New Testament in this language, which

it was his intention to publish. Before however the work was ready for the press, he died. But Ford published all that had been collected with various additions and the correction of some mistakes, as an Appendix to the fac-simile of the *Cod. Alexandrinus* 1799, folio, Oxford. In this splendidly printed work, the New Testament has still many chasms, which may be hereafter supplied out of MSS. in the Borgian Museum, of which Zoega has given an account and published some fragments.

We might have expected beforehand that the readings of this version would agree with the western class in both its families, the African and Latin. This is actually the case. The text most frequently coincides with the Cambridge MS. D. It also harmonises with the old Latin, the Peshito, and the oldest MSS. A. B. C. D. E. F. G.

The agreement with D. in the Acts is very marked. Thus i. 2, the words κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον are inserted before οὓς ἐξελέξατο. D. has καὶ ἐκέλευσε κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. In i. 5, ἕως τῆς πεντεκοστῆς is appended in the version and in D. In v, 4, for τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο the Sahidic and D. have ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν. v, 35, they have τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς συνεδρίους. viii. 1, to διωγμὸς μέγας these documents add, καὶ θλῖψις; and after τῶν ἀποστόλων they have οἱ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Acts x. 23, for εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐξένισε the Sahidic, Peshito, and D. have τότε εἰσαγαγὼν ὁ πέτρος ἐξένισεν αὐτούς. In xv. 23, the Syriac, Sahidic, and MSS. of the Latin have γράψαντες ἐπιστολήν for γράψαντες.*

In the Pauline epistles it frequently agrees with D. or the Clermont MS. in addition to the old Latin and the oldest MSS.; but it is unnecessary to give examples.

2. *Memphitic.*

This version has been published entire, so that it is better known than the Sahidic. The edition of Wilkins appeared at Oxford in 1716 in quarto, with the title *Novum Testamentum*

* See Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. v. pp. 18, 19.

Ægyptium, vulgo Copticum, ex MSS. Bodlejanis descripsit, cum Vaticanis et Parisiensibus contulit, et in Latinum sermonem convertit, David Wilkins. No other edition was attempted till Schwartze began a better and more correct one, of which the gospels were published at Leipzig in 1846, 1847. In the preparation of this edition the author made use of MSS. in the royal library of Berlin. It was interrupted by his death, but his papers passed into the hands of Petermann of Berlin and Boetticher of Halle, the latter of whom is continuing the work. Already the Acts have appeared.

The agreement of the Memphitic and Sahidic is very remarkable in many cases. Thus they verbally coincide in Matt. xviii. 35, where they omit *τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν;* in Matt. xxv. 16, where they omit *τάλαντα* after *ἄλλα πέντε;* in Luke xxiii. 23, where they leave out *καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων;* in Matt. xviii. 29, where they omit *τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ;* in Matt. xix. 3, where they have *καὶ λέγοντες* without *αὐτῷ;* in Matt. xix. 9, where they have *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας;* in Matt. xix. 4, where they have *εἶπεν* without *αὐτοῖς;* in Matt. xix. 25, where they have *οἱ μαθηταί* alone, without *αὐτοῦ;* in Matt. xx. 6, where they read *ἑστῶτας* without *ἀργούς;* in Matt. xx. 7, where they omit *καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δίκαιον, λήψεσθε;* in Matt. xx. 22, 23, where both omit *καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι;* in John ix. 26, where they leave out *πάλιν;* in John ix. 31, where they read *οἴδαμεν* only; in John x. 4, where they have *τὰ ἴδια πάντα;* in John x. 13, where they omit *ὁ δὲ μισθωτὸς φεύγει.** Such agreement might almost lead to the supposition that the one translator had the work of the other before him. But that can hardly have been, especially as the two are quite independent of one another in many cases. They differ as often as they agree.

Attempts have been made by Münter, Hug and others, to distinguish the form of the text which the version exhibits in

* See Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. v. pp. 7, 8.

different parts. But they have not been successful or satisfactory. On the whole its readings agree with the oldest text, that of the MSS. A. B. C. D. L.; also the Peshito and Old Latin. They belong therefore to the western class, including both the African and Latin families. Münter thinks that the text of our version in the gospels inclines more to the Western, in the Acts and epistles to the Alexandrine recensions.* But when it agrees with A. B. C., the Syriac Peshito and Vulgate usually coincide with it. In the epistle to the Romans, though it often agrees with A. C. yet it sometimes follows the text in D. E. F. G. Thus with the former it omits Romans xvi. 24; but with the latter authorities it coincides in vii. 23, x. 5, 8, xiv. 16, xv. 10. In the gospels it often agrees with A. B. C. De Wette, who appears to have given particular attention to the text, observes that it follows none of the characteristic readings of D. in the gospels; and that in Mark i. ii. it coincides eleven times with Alexandrine copies.† A few examples will suffice to shew the nature of its readings.

Mark ii. 9, ἔγειρε ἆρον without the καί, and similarly in verse 11. Here it is accompanied by A. C. D. L. in the former case, and A. B. C. D. L., &c. in the latter.

Mark ii. 22, ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος, without νέος, in the Memphitic and B. D. L.; Mark v. 36, εὐθέως is omitted in it and B. D. L. So too in Luke viii. 9, λέγοντες is left out in it and B. D. L., &c. Mark v. 13, εὐθέως is not acknowledged by it or B. C. L. Mark v. 14, instead of τοὺς χοίρους it has merely αὐτούς, with B. C. D. L. In Mark iii. 31, the order is ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοι αὐτοῦ in the Coptic, B. C. D. L., &c. In Mark v. 9, for ἀπεκρίθη λέγων, it has λέγει αὐτῷ only, with A. B. C. K.** L. M. In Mark v, 11, for πρὸς τὰ ὄρη it reads πρὸς τῷ ὄρει, with A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. K. L. M. S. Mark v, 12, the received text has καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν πάντες; πάντες is wanting in the

* In Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek. vol. iv. p. 403.

† Einleitung, p. 23.

Coptic, B. C. D. K. L. M. In Acts ii. 7, πρὸς ἀλλήλους is wanting in A. B. C.* and the Coptic. In Acts ii. 30, this version with A. C. D. wants τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστόν. In Phil. i. 14, for τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν the Coptic and A. B. have τόν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖν. Philip. ii. 3, for ἢ κενοδοξίαν of the received text, this version together with A. C. has μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν. Philip. iii. 16, the Coptic, A. and B. have τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν simply.*

It has been inquired whether the Sahidic or Memphitic version was the older. Though it is impossible to ascertain the particular period at which either first appeared, yet it is probable that neither was subsequent to the first half of the fourth century. We can only arrive at a conclusion which will be likely to recommend itself to general acceptance by considering the respective necessities and circumstances of the upper and lower divisions of the country, as well as the characteristics of the dialects that prevailed in them. The Greek language was introduced first into Alexandria, and obtained greatest currency there. Alexandria was its chief seat and centre, whence it spread into other districts of the country. It maintained its influence the longest there. There it was most difficult to be displaced. According to the position of districts in relation to this capital city, would be the slower or more speedy introduction of the Greek. The necessity of a version would be soonest felt in the district where Hellenism made least way, the ancient language soon recovering its position after the extinction of the Greek supremacy. This was in upper Egypt, the part farthest from Alexandria, where the Greek tongue never succeeded in supplanting the old Egyptian. Hence the Sahidic or Thebaic version was probably the more ancient. With this agrees the character of the Sahidic itself. It contains a greater number of Greek words than the version of lower Egypt, because it was made at a time when the

* See Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. v. p. 9.

Egyptian still retained many of the foreign materials that had been forced into it. But on the other hand, the Memphitic was not made till the old language had been purified to a great extent of foreign elements. Hence it contains fewer Greek words. Probably a century is not too much to assume as the interval of time between the Sahidic and Memphitic. The former may be assigned to the latter part of the second; the latter to the second half of the third century.*

3. *Bashmuric.*

Fragments of a version apparently in another dialect of Egypt have been discovered. This third dialect has been called *Bashmuric.* It is difficult however to tell the part of the country it belongs to. Bashmur is a province in lower Egypt in the Delta to the east, as has been shewn by Zoega † and Quatremere,‡ thus demolishing Georgi's opinion that Bashmur was about the Ammonian oasis. The fragments hitherto discovered are but few, and were published at different times in separate parts by Georgi and Münter, Zoega and Engelbreth. They consist of a few parts of the Old Testament, and in the New of John iv. 28-34, iv. 36-40, iv. 43-47, iv. 48-53, &c.; 1 Corinth. vi. 9—ix. 16, 1 Corinth. xiv. 3—xv. 35; Eph. vi. 18—Phil. ii. 2; 1 Thes. i. 1—iii. 5; and Heb. v. 5—x. 22. Georgi had previously published John vi. 4-59, vi. 68—viii. 23, which Quatremere holds not to be Bashmuric. The fragments in question were published independently of one another by Engelbreth, in 1811 4to, at Copenhagen; and by Zoega in his catalogue of the Borgiano-Coptic MSS.

These fragments have given rise to much difference of opinion. Some claim for the Bashmuric the rank of a particular dialect, as Georgi and Engelbreth; while Münter and

* Hug's Einleitung, vol. i. p. 369.

† Catalogus codd. Copt. MSS. Musei Borgiani, pp. 140-144.

‡ Recherches sur la langue et la littérature de l'Egypte, v. p. 147, et seq.

Champollion the younger perceive no necessity for distinguishing it in that manner. Hug supposes it to be the idiom of middle Egypt, and is inclined to identify Bashmur with Faiom. Both he and De Wette doubt whether a third dialect should be assumed. The most probable supposition is, that what is termed Bashmuric is but an idiom of the Thebaic or Sahidic dialect; and that the fragments are no part of a separate version, but merely the Sahidic transferred into the idiom of a particular district nearer upper than lower Egypt, yet between the two. The text agrees with the Sahidic; and is therefore of the Alexandrine or Western type.*

* See Hug's Einleitung, vol. i. p. 369, et seq.

CHAPTER XIV.

ARMENIAN VERSION.

Armenian literature began with Miesrob the inventor of a new alphabet in the beginning of the fifth century. Before him, the Armenians used Persian and Syrian letters. After inventing a new alphabet and communicating the knowledge of it to the king and the patriarch of the country, schools were established under their influence, and Miesrob went into Iberia. On his return, Isaac the patriarch was translating the Bible from the old Syriac, there being no Greek MSS. in the country. But this work was laid aside after Joseph and Eznak, or as they are called by Moses Chorenensis, John Ecelensis and Joseph Palnensis, returned from the council at Ephesus (A. D. 431), bringing with them, in addition to the decrees of the Synod, a carefully written copy of the Scriptures in the Greek language. Still Miesrob and Isaac felt the necessity of a better acquaintance with Greek for the purpose of executing so arduous a task, and therefore the two scholars Joseph and Eznak repaired to Alexandria to study the language in the school of that city. Hence we owe the Armenian version of the Bible to Joseph and Eznak. Their contemporary, the historian Moses Chorenensis, is said to have assisted in the work.* As to the tradition about John Chrysostom

* See Mosis Chorenensis Historia Armeniaca, Lib. iii. cap. 61, pp. 312, 313. ed. Whiston.

encouraging the Armenians to translate their sacred books during his exile at Kukus in Armenia, it wants support.*

The original account implies, that the Old Testament was made from the Septuagint, and the New from the original Greek.

According to Gregory Bar Hebraeus it was interpolated from the Peshito or old Syriac—Isaac and Miesrob comparing it after its completion from the Greek with that version.† It is not very certain, however, whether this was done; though the statement is favoured by the great agreement existing between the Armenian and Peshito. If we knew that there was a historical foundation for the assertion of Bar Hebraeus, it should be unhesitatingly received; but probably it was nothing more than affirmation. Yet Hug unhesitatingly receives it and finds it easy to separate the Peshito readings. When Alford‡ says that the Armenian was originally made from *the Syriac versions* he is certainly in error.

The cause of agreement may lie in the MS. or MSS. used. Those at the basis of the Peshito and Armenian were alike in their texts; and therefore the derivative translations present many coincidences.

The readings of the Armenian and the old Latin are also alike in many cases. This has been accounted for by interpolation from the Vulgate. All latinising passages have been referred to the thirteenth century when the churches of Armenia submitted to the Pope, under the reign of the bigot Haitho. The tradition is that Haitho took steps to procure a new edition of the Armenian Bible, and that out of attachment to the Romish church he altered much according to the Latin of the Vulgate which he was able to read himself. From the fact of the passage respecting the three witnesses

* Anonyma vita Chrysostomi, c. 113.

† Walton's Prolegomena, p. 621, ed. Dathe.

‡ Greek Testament, vol. i. Prolegomena, § 3.

being cited in a council held thirty-seven years after his death at Sis in Armenia, and its being found in other Armenian documents, the interpolation of 1 John v. 7 is ascribed to his edition of the version, there being no trace of it previously; and on this basis has been built the supposition that Haitho may have altered other places also. It is possible that Haitho inserted 1 John v. 7 in his edition. It *may have been* taken from the Vulgate either by him or at his suggestion. But the hypothesis of a general interpolation from the Latin at the same time is precarious. One leading passage is insufficient to establish it. The readings that appear to *latinise* may not have originated in this manner. They seem indeed to have been derived from ancient MSS. at least for the most part. While therefore we *may allow* the insertion of 1 John v. 7 in the thirteenth century in the reign of Haitho (1224-1270), we are reluctant to admit a general corruption of the Armenian from the Latin at the same time. No proof of it has yet been adduced. All that has been said for it resolves itself into conjecture.*

Hug assigns to the text a mixed character, because he thinks that the readings of the old Syriac, the MS. brought from Ephesus, and Alexandrine copies all contributed to it at first.† This explanation is unsatisfactory and useless. Nor is Eichhorn's account better, because it rests on his peculiar view of recensions. In general the text is of the western class, including both families of it. This explains the agreement of it with D. the old Latin, the Peshito, B. and Origen, though the agreement is not such as is uniform or consistent throughout a single book or epistle. The text is apparently in an imperfect state, and still needs to be critically revised and edited from ancient MSS. Many of the readings peculiar to itself are simple mistakes, or are owing to the licenses taken by the translator or transcribers.

* Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. v. pp. 84, 85. † Einleitung, vol. i. p. 352.

Examples of readings coinciding with the Peshito are such as Mark ii. 25 Ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν, where the Syriac has αὐτοῖς besides; vi. 6, κώμας without κύκλῳ; viii. 24, 25, εἶτα is omitted between περιπατοῦντας and πάλιν; ix. 4, σὺν Μωσεῖ συλλαλοῦντες; ix. 29, νηστείᾳ καὶ προσευχῇ; x. 43, γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας; xii. 33, ἐξιν τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων without πάντων; xii. 38, καὶ φιλούντω ἀσπασμούς. Luke ii. 49, ὅτι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός; ix. 6, κατὰ κώμας καὶ κατὰ πόλεις. Matt. xxviii. 18, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· καὶ καθῶς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατήρ μου, κἀγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς.

Examples where other ancient authorities, especially D. and the old Latin coincide with it are, Matt. xv. 32, where after τρεῖς are inserted εἰσιν, καί; Matt. xviii. 33, οὐκ ἔδει οὖν καὶ σε. Matt. xix. 10, instead of τοῦ ἀνθρώπου there is τοῦ ἀνδρός in the Armenian, D., old Latin, &c. Mark ii. 9, Ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου for περιπάτει; ii. 26, ἔφαγεν, καὶ ἔδωκε————οὖσι, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστι, &c.; iv. 39, τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ εἶπε; v. 33, δι' ὃ πεποιήκει λάθρα is inserted after τρέμουσα. More frequently other witnesses agree, such as Origen, in John iv. 30, 46; Galat. iv. 21, 25, &c.*

The Armenian version was not printed till after the middle of the seventeenth century. In 1662 it was determined by the Armenian bishops at a Synod, to have the Bible printed in their language in Europe. For this purpose Uscan, as he is commonly called, of Erivan, was despatched to Europe. After various fruitless efforts, the whole Bible was printed at Amsterdam in 1666 4to. In 1668 appeared the New Testament alone 8vo. La Croze was the first who charged bishop Uscan, as he is termed, (though he was not properly a bishop) with altering the text according to the Vulgate.† Later editions, of which Uscan's was the basis, were issued in 1705

* See Eichhorn, Einleit. vol. v. p. 80, et seq.; and Hug, Einleit. vol. i. p. 353.

† Thesaurus Epistol. Lacrozianus, vol. ii. p. 290; and in Masch's Le Long, vol. ii. part 1, pp. 175, 176.

4to, at Constantinople, and in 1733 at Venice in folio. A much better one was published by Dr. J. Zohrab at Venice in 1789 8vo. As the Uscan edition contained 1 John v. 7, this has the same passage with an asterisk, for the editor was reluctant to leave it out, though it was found in no Armenian MS., as he himself admitted to Professor Alter of Vienna.* This edition was reprinted in 1816.

In 1805 Dr. Zohrab prepared and published a critical edition one volume folio, or four vols. 8vo. The text was printed chiefly from a Cilician MS. of the fourteenth century; but the editor collated it with eight MSS. of the whole Bible and twenty of the New Testament, the various readings of which are subjoined in the lower margin.† The text of this edition was collated for Scholz by Cirbied, professor of the Armenian language at Paris, and several monks. Another edition was published at Petersburgh in 1814, and another at Moscow in 1834. It was stated to Tischendorf by Aucher in 1843, that he and other monks in the island of St. Lazarus near Venice had undertaken a new critical edition. We cannot tell whether it has yet been published.

The extracts from this version in our critical editions of the Greek Testament are still very incomplete. Indeed the state of the version itself is unsettled. *Ancient* MSS. of it would be very desirable; but there are none reaching beyond the twelfth century. And none believed to be prior to Haitho have been examined for the purpose of discovering if they have 1 John v. 7. There is no doubt that it was in none of Zohrab's MSS.; but that does not settle the question of its interpolation in the thirteenth century. It must first be proved, that one of the MSS. at least was prior to the time of Haitho. But none of

* See Michaelis's Introduction by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 616, translator's note.

† On what authority some state that Zohrab used sixty-nine MSS. *i. e.* eight of the entire Bible, and the rest of the New Testament, we are unable to say.

them was so old. The oldest belonged to the fourteenth century.

We have no hesitation in saying that there has been little use in employing the Armenian, though it has been styled *the queen of versions*, in the criticism of the Greek Testament. The suspicious circumstances it has passed through, the alterations it has undergone, and the want of ancient MSS. of its text, combine to shew that it may be safely dispensed with at the present time.

CHAPTER XV.

GEORGIAN AND OTHER VERSIONS.

The Georgian or Iberian version was taken from the Greek in the Old Testament and from the original in the New. It is supposed to have been made in the sixth century. The edition published at Moscow in 1743 folio was interpolated from the Slavonian version by the Georgian princes Arkil and Wacuset. Another was published in 1816 at the same place. It was from this latter that Petermann reprinted the epistle to Philemon by way of specimen at Berlin 1844. The version has been little used in critical editions of the Greek Testament, because it was interpolated so early from the Slavonic, and because so few have given their attention to it. Alter collected various readings from it and discoursed very learnedly of its nature in a volume published at Vienna in 1798 8vo. Few except Petermann have since understood or studied the language. According to Scholz and Tischendorf, there are a number of ancient MSS. of it in the monastery of the Holy Cross near Jerusalem. Two MSS. of the gospels are known to be in the Vatican. There is no use in this version for critical purposes. It should be henceforward discarded as a source of various readings.

PERSIAN.

There is a version of the gospels in the Persian language published by Wheloc and Pierson at London in folio, which is said to have two title pages, one dated 1652 the other 1657.

One is *Quatuor evangelia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Persice, ad numerum situmque verborum Latine data.* The other is, *Quatuor evangeliorum Domini nostri Jesu Christi versio Persica, Syriacam et Arabicam suavissime redolens: ad verba et mentem Graeci textus fideliter et venuste concinnata.*

It is not easy to tell the source or sources of this version. We learn from Pierson's preface, that Wheloc had three MSS. of the Persic gospels, one from Oxford, another from Cambridge, the third a MS. belonging to Pococke. But the only Persic MS. Pococke had contained the text printed in the London Polyglott, which was not made directly from the Greek but the Syriac. Hence Wheloc must have used both Persic and Syriac MSS. If so, the text is of a mixed character and of no value. Though it be regarded as taken from the Greek, it cannot be said that it was wholly so. The criticism of the New Testament should discard all Persian versions as worthless.

ARABIC VERSIONS.

It has been thought that two Arabic versions of the New Testament taken immediately from the Greek have been published, and accordingly they have been used as such by critical editors of the Greek Testament. But one of them must be dislodged from the position it has so long occupied in the estimation of scholars. The Arabic version of the gospels must be discarded as useless, for it was not made from the original but from the Vulgate. We should therefore consistently omit all mention of the version in question. But we shall just *allude* to the various impressions of it for the purpose of shewing what an inextricable jumble has been made of its text by means of MSS., which are of no value, arbitrary changes of editors, and readings out of other versions, including the Vulgate in the condition it was found in by the scholars who superintended the printing of the Arabic.

1. A version of the four gospels first printed at the Medicean press in Rome, 1591 folio, in Arabic alone. In the same year and from the same press issued another in Arabic and Latin (interlinear), folio, with many rude pictures interspersed throughout the pages. The Latin version was annexed by J. Baptista Raymundus. The relation between these two editions has not been clearly pointed out. Indeed they are often confounded. Those who speak of one usually mean the Arabic and Latin one, which was reprinted in 1619 folio; or rather the edition of 1619 is the very same with a new title-page. The text of this edition was transferred to the Paris Polyglott.

2. Another impression of the same version was taken from a Leyden MS. and published by Erpenius or Erpen in 1616, from a MS. of upper Egypt belonging to the thirteenth century. Erpen also consulted in preparing this edition the Medicean one, which he found to deviate frequently from his own MS. in the first thirteen chapters of Matthew, but in other places to be in much greater accordance with it, and some old MSS. which are not described, so that we cannot tell whether they were used in the gospels alone, or in the other books of the New Testament. The other parts of Erpenius's edition are not from the Vulgate. It was made from the old Syriac in the Acts and epistles.

3. Another impression was that in the Paris Polyglott 1645. Gabriel Sionita, under whose care the version was prepared for the press, followed the Medicean text (the Arabic and Latin edition), but not closely or constantly. He made many alterations in it, not merely for the sake of grammatical purity, but other changes, even where MSS. agree independently of one another.

4. Another impression was printed in the London Polyglott 1657. Here Castell appears to have repeated Sionita's alterations, and to have taken none from Walton's MS., though

it frequently departs from the Medicean and Erpenian texts. Walton says nothing of its being used in the Polyglott.

5. A fifth impression appeared at Rome 1703 folio, from the Propaganda press. This is the Karshuni New Testament, containing both the Peshito and the Arabic.

All these impressions were ultimately derived from three MSS., viz. those at the basis of the Roman, Erpenian, and Karshuni texts; for the text of the Paris Polyglott follows the Roman with alterations we know not whence taken; the text of the London Polyglott follows the Paris one; and the text of the Karshuni edition was from a Cyprian MS. Thus the printed Arabic gospels resolve themselves into the Roman, Leyden, and Cyprian MSS.

There can be no doubt that all exhibit the text of one and the same version; since Storr proved the substantial sameness of it in them.*

John, bishop of Seville in the eighth century, translated the Scriptures into Arabic from the Vulgate or Jerome's Latin version. Now the Roman edition of the gospels which was the first printed was not from the Greek original, but was taken from a MS. containing the version made in Spain from the Latin. Its resemblance to the Vulgate has always led to the opinion that it was *altered* by the Roman censors to accord with the Vulgate; but it has been shewn that it is the Arabic version which was originally made in Spain from the Latin itself. Professor Juynboll of Leyden has proved this from an examination of an Arabic MS. at Franeker, which contains the same Arabic version.† Hence the evidences adduced by Hug ‡ and others for the purpose of demonstrating a Greek original are nugatory. They merely serve to shew that it has been *interpolated* from the Greek, and that too in a very bungling and ignorant way. It has also suffered interpolation from the

* Dissertat. Inaug. Crit. de Evangeliis Arabicis, Tübingen, 1775 4to.

† Letterkundige Bijdragen, Leyden, 1838. ‡ Einleit. vol. i. p. 389.

Syriac and Coptic. This was natural and almost unavoidable from the way in which it was used. When the Syrians began to feel the want, they adopted the Arabic as their church version, and altered it to a certain degree of conformity with their old church version, the Peshito.

So too the Copts adapted the Arabic to *their* ancient church version. When the Syrians and Copts did so they wrote both together in MSS. side by side, so as to have a Syro-Arabic and an Arabico-Coptic text respectively; and it is easy to see that the Arabic would not be kept pure in such circumstances. The procedure of the Arabic copyists and the way in which they confounded different texts may be seen from a MS. at Vienna, No. 43, which in the gospels has numerous various readings between the lines and in the margin, with the sources indicated, such as the Peshito, the Memphitic version, and the Greek text.

As to the persons who first *adapted* and *regulated* the Arabico-Coptic and Syro-Arabian texts, the accounts are uncertain. In the MS. from which Erpenius printed the Leyden text there is a subscription. But Erpenius printed no more than a Latin translation of it.* This subscription speaks of Nesjulamam the son of Azalkesat. Michaelis and Hug think that it was he who altered the Arabic text according to the Coptic version. But Erpenius and Storr infer that he was *the translator*. If the codex of Erpenius be now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, there can be no room for diversity of opinion as to the person mentioned being merely the transcriber. And indeed the subscription of the codex now there,

* It is this :—Absoluta est libri hujus descriptio die 16 mensis Baunae (16 Jun.) anno 988 martyrum justorum. Descriptus autem est ex emendatissimo exemplari, cujus descriptor ait, se id descripsisse ex alio exemplari emendato, exarato manu Johannis episcopi Coptitae, qui Johannes dicit, se suum descripsisse ex exemplari emendatissimo, quod edidit D. Nesjulamam F. Azalkesati.

whether it be identical with that of Erpenius or not, shews that he was not the translator. It is quite probable however that Dr. Lee is correct in identifying the two MSS.; if so, the public are indebted to him for the subscription in its proper language and a correct Latin version. The reasons he gives for the identity of both are very plausible.*

Let us now look at the text of each impression separately.

1. The Roman text has been examined most successfully by Juynboll.

2. That of Erpen was derived from a Coptic-Arabic MS.

3. The text of the Paris Polyglott was taken from the Roman edition, with some alterations made by Gabriel Sionita.

4. The text as printed in the London Polyglott was a reimpression of the Paris text. Marsh says† it was not a bare reimpression, referring to Walton's Prolegomena xiv. § 17, and Mill's Prolegomena, § 1295; but Walton says nothing to the purpose in that section. Mill indeed states that the London text was amended and supplied in many places with the aid of MSS., but the assertion rests on no basis. As long as Walton himself says nothing of the MS. he had being used by Castell, and in the absence of a collation of the two texts, we must hold that the one is a mere reimpression of the other.

5. The Carshuni New Testament, printed at the propaganda press at Rome for the use of the Maronites, contains the same text as the Erpenian of the gospels. It was printed from a MS. brought from Cyprus, which MS. the editors preferred

* His translation of the subscription is this :—"Fuit cessatio a describendo hunc librum (die) 16 mensis Bauna, anno 988 Martyrum sanctorum (A.D. 1272). Et descriptus est hic liber ex exemplari cujus descriptor memoriae prodidit, se id ex exemplari a manu Johannis Episcopi Coptorum scripto, descripsisse. Dixerat praeterea Johannes memoratus, se hoc descripsisse ex exemplari manuscripto, quod senex Nash Antistes ille, filius Iz El Kafah, contulerat." Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglott, p. 45.

† Notes to Michaelis's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 603.

to several others they had, on account of its accuracy. One column contains the Peshito, the other the Carshuni.

But we have dwelt too long on a version which is only *mediate*. Henceforth let it be entirely banished from the region of criticism as useless.

In the London and Paris Polyglotts is another Arabic version, containing the Acts, Pauline, and Catholic epistles, and the Apocalypse. It is stated by the printer of the Paris Polyglott, Anthony Vitre, that the MS. from which these books were edited came from Aleppo.

Internal evidence shews that they were translated directly from the Greek. Thus in Acts xix. 9, τυράννου τινός is, *one of the nobles;* xii. 13, Ῥόδη, a proper name, is *rosa;* xxviii. 11, ἐν πλοίῳ παρακεχειμακότι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, Ἀλεξανδρινῷ, παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις is, *in a ship of Alexandria which had wintered in that island (belonging to) an Alexandrian named Dioscorides;* 2 Corinth. vi. 14, μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες τοῖς ἀπίστοις, *let not your scales incline towards unbelievers;* Jude, verse 12, οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν σπιλάδες, συνευωχούμενοι, *these are they who cause their prostitutes to recline with them at feasts.*

Hug does not venture to class the Apocalypse along with the other books as proceeding from the same hand; but holds the common origin of the rest, relying on a similarity in the language and mode of translation, difficult passages being often paraphrased, united with careful fidelity in rendering, especially in the case of words compounded with μετὰ, σὺν and πρό.

It has also been supposed that the text has not escaped foreign additions. The same word is frequently translated twice; and small clauses are also rendered twice in different words. Comp. Acts xv. 15, 28; xvi. 37, 39; xxi. 11, 13, 27; Acts viii. 7. The same critic thinks that the Apocalypse was translated from a MS. interpolated from the scholia of Andreas of Cappadocia.

The author himself has indicated the country he belonged to in Acts ii. 9, where he renders, *the parts of Libya about Cyrene*, "*the parts of Africa, which is our country.*" It would appear therefore that he belonged to Cyrene. Hence the reading *Al Franjia* which occurs with the word Italy in Acts in xviii. 2, was of later origin than the version itself. In the time of the Crusades, we could not expect so accurate a knowledge of Greek in the parts about Cyrene.*

The text of it belongs to the Constantinopolitan or Eastern class, as is apparent from a partial collation of it made by Hug. Thus in Acts ii. 7, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, whereas A. C*, the Memphitic, and Æthiopic, omit πρὸς ἀλλήλους; ii. 23, ἔκδοτον λαβόντες διὰ χειρῶν, contrary to A. C., the Syriac, Armenian, Memphitic, Æthiopic, Vulgate; ii. 30, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστόν which it has, is omitted in A. C. D**, Syriac, Memphitic, Æthiopic, Vulgate. In 1 Corinth. vii. 3, ὀφειλομένην εὔνοιαν, differing from the ὀφειλήν of A. B. C. D. E. F. G., Memphitic, Bashmuric, Æthiopic, Armenian. 1 Corinth. vii. 5, τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ, in opposition to the τῇ προσευχῇ of A. B. C. D. E. F. G., Bashmuric, Æthiopic, &c; vii. 13, ἀφιέτο αὐτόν, in opposition to ἀφιέτο τὸν ἄνδρα of A. B. C. D. E. F. G., &c. †

The value of this version is very small. It is modern, and represents a modern form of the text. It is not worth collating for critical purposes, and may be safely neglected. Indeed we can see no need for it in the department of New Testament criticism.

It is stated by Hug that the text which was reprinted in the London Polyglott from the Paris one, was repeated in the New Testament part of the Arabic Bible printed at Newcastle on Tyne 1811 4to, under the superintendence of Prof. Carlyle.‡

* See Hug's Einleitung, vol. i. p. 397, et seq. † Ibid, p. 401.
‡ Ibid, p. 402.

An Arabic version found in a Vatican MS. (No. 13) by Scholz, and partially collated by him, contains Matthew, Mark, Luke, and the Pauline epistles. The version was made from the Greek at Emesa in Syria by Daniel Philentolos and his son, as appears from the Greek postscript. The text, according to Scholz, agrees sometimes with the Alexandrine, sometimes with the Constantinopolitan MSS. It is of no use in criticism, being neither ancient nor valuable. The name of the writer of the Arabic text is given. Kerycus, a deacon, added the Greek subscription and Greek notes in the margin.*

* See Scholz's Prolegomena in N. T. vol. i. p. 128 ; Scholz's Biblisch-kritische Reise, p. 117-126 ; and Hug, vol. i. p. 394, et seq.

CHAPTER XVI.

GOTHIC VERSION.

The Maeso-Goths were a Germanic race who settled on the borders of the Greek empire, and their language is substantially a Germanic dialect. Ulphilas, or Wulphilas,* who was ordained first bishop of the Christian Wisigoths by Eusebius of Nicomedia, A. D. 348, translated the Bible into the Gothic from the Greek, *i. e.* from the Septuagint in the Old Testament, and the original in the New. It is with the later only we are at present concerned.

Unfortunately the New Testament has not been preserved entire, as far as yet known.

In 1665, Francis Junius published at Dort, in Gothic letters expressly cast for the purpose, the four gospels from the celebrated codex argenteus or silver MS., which was accompanied by the Anglo-Saxon version of the same gospels under the editorship of Thomas Marshall an Englishman. Junius had a very faithful transcript of the codex made by Derrer which accompanied it till 1702. But he carefully consulted the original codex also.

A reprint appeared at Amsterdam in 1684. The version was also published, with various improvements, by G. Stirnhielm at Stockholm 1671 4to, from Derrer's transcript. Arch-

* See G. Waitz, Ueber das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila. Hanover, 1840, 4to.

bishop Benzelius of Upsal made preparations for a new edition, but dying in the meantime, it was published by Edward Lye at Oxford, 1750 4to.

Soon after, fragments of the Gothic version of Paul's epistle to the Romans were discovered by F. A. Knittel in a MS. belonging to the Wolfenbüttel library at Brunswick, which he edited and gave to the public in 1762 4to. They were again edited by Johann Ihre, at Upsal, 1763 4to, and included in the collection of treatises written by Ihre in illustration of the version and its codices, which Büsching edited at Berlin, 1773 4to.

In 1808, J. Ch. Zahn published both the gospels and the fragments of the epistle to the Romans, in one edition, 4to, at Weissenfels. The gospels were printed here from a very exact transcript of the codex argenteus made for Ihre many years before, which after passing through the hands of Büsching and another, came into those of Zahn. This edition contains a literal Latin interlinear translation, a grammar and glossary by Fulda and Rheinwald, and Ihre's Latin version by the side of the text. It also contains a critical review, explanatory notes, and an introduction from the pen of the editor.

Other fragments were discovered by Angelo Mai among the rescript MSS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan, in the year 1817. Having communicated his discoveries to Count Castiglioni, the latter joined him in his researches. The fragments discovered were printed successively at Milan partly under the joint care of both, but chiefly by Castiglioni, in 1819, 1829, 1834, 1835, 1839. These fragments contain considerable portions of Paul's epistles, except that to the Hebrews, with two parts of Matthew's gospel; and have been admirably edited.

But the most complete edition—that which surpasses all the rest in accurate and scholarly treatment of the version—is

that published by H. C. de Gabelentz and Dr. J. Loebe in two volumes 4to at Leipzig, vol. i. 1836; vol. ii. part 1, 1843. part 2, 1846. This work contains a Latin version, a Gothic grammar and dictionary with critical annotations. The text is in Roman type.

Having spoken of the principal editions, we must allude to the remarkable MS. of the gospels from which they have been printed.

The *codex argenteus* has been always regarded with interest since it was first known. It consists of 188 pages in quarto size, on very thin, smooth vellum, which is mostly of a purple colour. On this the letters which are uncial were afterwards made in silver, the initials and some others excepted, which are in gold. To the latter belong the first three lines of Luke and Mark's gospels, which are imprinted with gold foil, as were probably those of Matthew and John's gospels. Michaelis conjectured that the letters were either imprinted with a warm iron, or cut with a graver and afterwards coloured. But it has been since proved that each letter is *painted*. Most of the silver letters have become green in the progress of time, but the golden ones are still in a good state of preservation. Some parts of the codex have a pale violet hue. It is not entire, being supposed to have contained at first 320 pages. The history of this MS. has been a chequered one. It is thought to have belonged to Alaric, King of Toulouse, whose palace was destroyed by Clovis in the beginning of the sixth century; but others say that it belonged to Amalric, who was conquered by Childebert, A. D. 531. The MS. was preserved for centuries in the Benedictine monastery of Werden in Westphalia, where it was discovered by one Marillon in 1597. From this place it was transmitted during a war in the seventeenth century to Prague, for security. When that city was stormed by the Swedes in 1648, the book fell into the hands of Count Königsmark, who presented it to Queen Christina. By her it

was presented to the Royal Library at Stockholm, whence it disappeared during the commotion which preceded her abdication, having been taken to the Netherlands by Isaac Vossius, librarian to the Swedish Queen. Perhaps the Queen made him a present of it; for it is hardly probable that he stole it. It was in the Netherlands that Junius examined it and reduced it to order. Some say that the Count de la Gardie purchased it of Vossius, and presented it to the University of Upsal; others that it was Charles XII. who purchased it back and presented it to the University.

It is not likely that it is the very copy which Ulphilas himself wrote, since Benzelius, Ihre, and others have discovered various readings in some of its margins, shewing it to have been written when there were several copies of the version, probably in Italy, where Latin readings were put in its margin. This is favoured by the circumstance that the gospels are arranged in the order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, the same order as that which they exhibit in the Brescian and Veronian MSS. Other internal marks adduced by Hug favour the same country as the birth-place of this celebrated MS., where it must have been made at the latest in the beginning of the sixth century, before the supremacy of the Goths in Italy was destroyed.*

It is matter of regret that so many pages are wanting in this MS. It has many chasms in the gospels. It is deficient in Matt. i. 5—v. 15; vi. 32—vii. 12; x. 1-23; xi. 25—xxvi. 70; xxviii. 1-20. Mark vi. 31-54; xii. 38—xiii. 18; xiii. 29—xiv. 5; xiv. 16-41; xvi. 12-20. Luke x. 30—xiv. 9; xvi. 24—xvii. 3; xx. 37-47. John i. 1—v. 45; xi. 47—xii. 1; xii. 49—xiii. 11; xix. 13-42. Individual verses here and there have also suffered mutilation, and some are almost illegible from age.

Some have held that the original language of the codex

* See Einleit. vol. i. pp. 443, 444.

argenteus is Frankish, as La Croze, Wetstein, and Michaelis. But the character of the dialect itself, containing as it does Greek and Latin words, as well as the discovery of several specimens of the Ostro-Gothic tongue in Italy resembling the character and language of the codex argenteus, prove that the language is *Moeso-Gothic*—the most ancient specimen extant of the Teutonic language. It belongs to the fourth century.

There can be no doubt that the version was made directly from the Greek. This is testified by Simeon Metaphrastes,* and the character of the work itself. Thus the orthography observed in it is borrowed from the Greek; the etymological sense of words is exhibited; terms are confounded in such a way as to shew the translator had the Greek before him; and Greek constructions are imitated—for example, the use of attraction, &c. Thus *i* is generally written *ei* as in Greek; *sokjis*, thou seekest, *sokjeis*. ὁλοκαυτώματα is etymologically rendered *alabrunste*, Mark xii. 33; σκηνοπηγία, *hlethrastakeins*, John vii. 3; ἐγκαίνια *innjugitha*, *innovation*, John x. 22. In Luke vii. 25 τρυφῇ has been confounded with τροφῇ; Romans xi. 33, ἀνεξερεύνητα is translated as if it were ἀνεξερεταα, &c. &c.

According to Hug, the version was made from a Greek MS. belonging to the Constantinopolitan or Lucianic recension; and in order to shew this he adduces readings from the eleventh chapter of Mark, the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, the fourth and fifth of the epistle to the Galatians, placing what he calls the Lucian (and Gothic) readings over against the Hesychian (Egyptian) readings.† Eichhorn adopts the same view, adding that the Byzantine text as exhibited in it is strongly mixed with the Hesychian.‡ But it is more correct to affirm that it belongs to no particular

* In Acta Septemb. v. 41. ed. Antverp.

† Einleitung, vol. i. p. 455, et seq. ‡ Einleit. vol. v. p. 99.

class of documents, neither to the eastern nor western. It is between the oldest condition of the text and that found in the junior Constantinopolitan codices. Hence it agrees with both, but with neither separately or continuously. As it often coincides with the oldest MSS. and versions, it should scarcely be classed with the junior Constantinopolitan recension. Thus in Matt. vi. 18, ἐν τῷ φανερῷ, is omitted by it, along with the most ancient codices; viii. 8 its reading is λόγῳ, instead of the received λόγον, agreeing with the best documents B. C., &c.; ix. 13, εἰς μετάνοιαν is left out with B. D. V. both the Syriac versions, &c.; ix. 35, ἐν τῷ λαῷ is omitted, with the same ancient class of authorities. Matt. xi. 2, it reads διὰ for δύο with B. C. D. P. Z. Δ, both the Syriac, Armenian, &c. Comp. also Mark i. 2, 11; ii. 1, 17, 18, 20. John vi. 22. Romans vii. 6 (ἀποθανόντες). Galat. ii. 14 (πῶς); iv. 17 (ὑμᾶς); iv. 26, πάντων is omitted. 1 Thes. v. 3, γάρ is omitted. The paragraph in John viii. 1, &c. is omitted. In Luke vi. 20, τῷ πνεύματι is added, in agreement with the Arabic, Armenian, Jerusalem Syriac, and other versions.*

There is no doubt, however, that the text often agrees with the modern one, in opposition to the oldest authorities. The readings adduced by Hug for this purpose are appropriate, though they are not so much *the rule* as he asserts. So too in Mark i. 5, 16, 34; John vi. 40, 58, 69; Romans vii. 18, 25; viii. 38; xi. 22; xii. 11; 1 Corinth. vii. 5; Galat. iii. 1; iv. 6, 15; 1 Thes. ii. 15; iv. 13. Sometimes it has the usual reading only in part, as Mark xi. 10, ἐν ὀνόματι, without κυρίου; Romans viii. 1, μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, without ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. It also unites two readings, as in Matt. vii. 8.†

It has been supposed that the text was interpolated at an early period from the Latin translation. It *Latinises.* The influence of the old Latin or Vulgate upon it is easily dis-

* See De Wette's Einleitung, p. 29.

† Ibid, pp. 29, 30.

cerned. The Goths became acquainted in Italy with copies of the old Latin version, and these furnished transcribers with additions. Sometimes indeed, the Latin was written by the side of the Gothic, so that the former readily contributed to the corruption of the latter. Readings of the Latin were also written in the margin, whence they were transferred to the text. Ihre enumerates fourteen marginal notes in the codex argenteus which would have been partly taken into the text in the next transcript. Thus at Luke ix. 34, some one put the Latin reading at the side, *et intrantibus illis in nubem*, as the Verona and Brescian MSS. have it. In consequence of such interpolations, the text of the version is less valuable than it would have been.

Many of these Latin appendages can be traced. Thus Matt. x. 29, *τῆς βουλῆς* is added, as several other versions, including the old Latin read. Mark xiv. 65, *cum voluntate seu libenter*. Luke i. 3, *et spiritui sancto* is added; ix. 43 we have the addition *Dixit Petrus, Domine quare nos non potuimus ejicere illum: Quibus dixit: quoniam ejusmodi oratione ejicitur et jejunio;* ix. 50, we have another appendage from the same source: *Nemo est enim qui non faciat virtutem in nomine meo.* Mark vii. 3, *crebro*. Luke ix. 20, *tu es Christus filius Dei.* 2 Corinth. v. 10, *ἴδια* instead of *διά*.* The best explanation of these peculiarities is that adopted by Zahn and other critics since his time, viz. that the text was altered in Italy after Latin MSS. which were current there. We know that the Gothic was known in Italy in the ninth century when the cod. Brixianus was written; and that its departures from the Latin had been noticed. Gabelentz and Loebe have pointed out several marginal Latin readings which were afterwards taken into the text; to which may be added the Euthalian subscriptions.†

* See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 115.

† Prolegomena to vol. i. p. 23.

It has been supposed by the two most recent editors of the version, that the two Gothic MSS. contain different recensions, an opinion to which Hug * refuses assent. Differences in the grammatical formation of separate words and in orthography can hardly justify the truth of the statement made by Gabelentz and Loebe. It is not well attested. As to the general character of the version, it is distinguished by literality, fidelity, and accuracy. It evinces judgment, learning, and skill on the part of bishop Ulphilas.

* See his Einleitung, vol. i. pp. 458, 459.

CHAPTER XVII.

SLAVONIC VERSION.

The old or church Slavic, commonly called Slavonic language, belongs to that people who settled at an early period on both banks of the Danube, and were mostly involved in the wars of the two Roman empires.

A version of the Bible into it was made by Constantine commonly called Cyril, and his brother Methodius, who preached the gospel in the ninth century to the Bulgarians and Moravians, and invented an alphabet. The Septuagint was followed in the Old Testament, and the original in the New.

What part of the translation was performed by Cyril, and what by Methodius, cannot now be ascertained. It is probable that Cyril translated at first the gospels, as still contained in a codex of A.D. 1144 in the library of the Synod at Moscow. Perhaps he also translated most of the New Testament; whereas the greater part at least of the books of the Old Testament were done by Methodius. The most ancient existing copy of the whole Bible is the codex of Moscow, of A.D. 1499; and that is thought to have been the first that was ever completed, the different parts not having been collected till then. The invention of the alphabet belongs exclusively to Cyril. It is likely, as Kopitar has shewn, that the old Slavic language in the time of Cyril and Methodius was peculiar to the *Pannonic* or *Carantano-Slavi*, the *Slovenzi* or *Vindes* of the

present times. These were the diocesans of Methodius, for whom the Scriptures were first translated, being carried at a later period to the Bulgarians and Moravians. For centuries however the Slavonic has ceased to be a language of common life, and is read only in the public worship of the church.

The translation is very literal and faithful, violating the idiom of the Slavonian for the sake of retaining the Greek construction. The position of words, and constructions follow the Greek text closely; many are not at all translated, but adopted as they are; and many Slavic words are formed solicitously after the Greek.

The MSS. used in making the version contained for the most part what is called the Constantinopolitan or later text. As Constantine and Methodius were born in Thessalonica and so belonged to the Constantinopolitan patriarchate, and were even sent from that place, they must have taken with them Constantinopolitan MSS.

The text however is not proper, unmixed Byzantine. There are in it many old readings belonging to the western class. Hug and Eichhorn agree in saying that the recension exhibited by the version is Constantinopolitan, mixed however with what they term Hesychian readings, or according to Hug's notion, with readings from the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις and from Egyptian MSS. Such language gives a false impression of the case, and explains nothing.

It is still matter of dispute, whether the version has been interpolated from the Latin. There are appearances favourable to the supposition. It is countenanced by Latinising readings. Dobrovsky however defends it from this charge.* According to him, it agrees remarkably with D. and L. Professor Alter, who carefully collated two MSS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna, enables us to see that the *prevailing* character is Constantinopolitan, and that its agreement with such authorities

* See his Slavanca, second part, 1815, Prague.

as D. L. the Vulgate, is not so great as to be *pervading* or *characteristic.*

On comparing it with the Gothic, it has been found that there is a frequent agreement with it in coincidence either with the common text or with the oldest. Both the Slavonic and Gothic have the old readings in Matt. viii. 8; Mark i. 11; John vi. 22, 39, 69; Gal. ii. 14, iv. 17; while on the other hand it exhibits the same kind of readings in Mark i. 34, ii. 9; John v. 40, 48 where it is deserted by the Gothic. Again, it agrees with the usual received text in opposition to the Gothic, in Matt. vi. 18, ix. 13, 35, xi. 2; Mark i. 2, 5, ii. 17, 18, 20; Romans x. 1, xiii. 9; though in more places the two versions together follow the Constantinopolitan text.*

The first edition of the gospels was published in 4to in Wallachia 1512. Afterwards they were published in folio at Wilna 1575; and again at Moscow in 1614. It was from this last that Alter collated the first fourteen chapters of John's gospel, and extracted the various readings in his edition of the Greek Testament. The whole Bible was published at Ostrog in Volhynia (Poland), 1581 folio, from which was taken the Moscow Bible, 1663 folio. It was the latter which was used by Dobrovsky in collating the version for Griesbach; but he had besides several MSS. of the Slavonic text. There are many more recent editions. Von Muralt recently collated two MSS. of the eleventh century—one that had been published in fac-simile by Silvestrius, containing the gospels; another belonging to St. Petersburg, containing the Acts and epistles.

The comparatively late date of this version prevents it from assuming the importance it might otherwise claim. It need not have been brought into the field of criticism at all. It may be dispensed with. We should therefore neglect it in future as a source of various readings. Besides its recent date, the suspicion of Latinising has not been wiped away from the *printed editions* of it at least.

* See De Wette, Einleit. p. 30.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE LATIN VERSION.

It has been disputed whether at a very early period there were several Latin versions of the Scriptures, or only one. The prevailing opinion has always been in favour of the former; those who take that view relying much on the words of Augustine and Jerome. And if the expressions of these fathers be rigidly interpreted according to the letter, they look as if they justified the opinion in question. Augustine in his treatise of Christian doctrine refers apparently to the multitude of Latin translations then current; but in a way to put his readers on their guard against the majority of them as having been made by persons not sufficiently qualified for the undertaking.* In like manner Jerome states that there were almost as many different texts as manuscripts.†

But whatever may be said of the sense *apparently* intended

* "Qui scripturas ex Hebraea lingua in Graecam verterunt numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari."—De Doctr. Christ. lib. ii. cap. 11.

† "Si Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant quibus? tot enim sunt exemplaria paene quot codices."—Praefat. in iv. Evangelia ad Damas.

by both writers, repeated reflection will serve to convince the scholar that they did not *really* mean to say that there was a very large number of distinct Latin translations in current use in their day. When they speak of the great discrepancy of Latin MSS. with one another they can hardly intend to convey the idea that there were very many authors of different versions in the Latin language. There was *one* translation—substantially and essentially one—the same which had been used long before the days of Augustine or Jerome. Originally that may have appeared *in parts* in different years (though with no great interval of time), but it was still but *one* version. It is likely that it first appeared in Africa in the second century, for even Tertullian made use of it so early as A.D. 190, unless indeed we suppose that the scripture texts found in his writings were rendered by himself from the Greek, which is very improbable. The text of this primitive version soon became deteriorated. Many persons meddled with it. It was altered, renovated, and patched by one and another in various places. It was interpolated from various sources. Hence it began rapidly to lose its individuality of character. Marginal suggestions were taken into it, parallel passages were incorporated, Greek MSS. furnished new readings for it which took the place of older ones. *It appeared as if* separate versions had all been mixed and mutually interpolated. It was not however by the mixing together of separate texts that this deterioration was effected, but rather by the petty mending of one Latin translation. To such a state of things the words of Augustine and Jerome refer, and not to independent versions—to a strange and pernicious license which early prevailed in altering and interpolating the Latin text.

In affixing this meaning to the words of Augustine and Jerome we believe that they are rightly interpreted, as Blanchini*

* Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinae versionis antiquae seu veteris Italicae, &c. vol. i. Prolegomena, p. 78, et seq.

and Sabatier* long since saw. Nor has the proper view escaped the sagacity of Eichhorn, Wiseman†, and Lachmann,‡ in modern times. In this case too Tischendorf§ has wisely followed Lachmann.

But does not Augustine speak in terms of commendation of one among the old Latin versions? Does he not specify the *Itala?*‖ He certainly preferred it to others, but it was not on that account a distinct version. It was a *recension* or *revised edition* of the *versio vetus*. That form of the old Latin which he called Itala or the *Italic* [recension] had been revised after Greek MSS. When the old Latin was received by the Italians, or more correctly a certain part of them, from Africa, it was carefully attended to, and improved after Greek copies.

This sense of the expression *Itala* has been abundantly proved by Wiseman, whose argument is repeated by Lachmann. The same Augustine in his treatise against Faustus repeats the same precept three times, saying first, that one should have recourse to the *exempla veriora;* then that the origin, *origo*, of the book published by the African heretic should be looked to; and lastly, that the doubt should be solved "ex aliarum regionum codicibus unde ipsa doctrina commeaverit," *i. e.* by the copies of other regions whence the doctrine itself emanated. Hence Augustine must have used *Italian* copies, or copies *conformed* to the *Italian*, espe-

* Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae, &c. &c. vol. i. praefat.

† Two letters on some parts of the controversy concerning 1 John v. 7; containing also an inquiry into the origin of the first Latin version of Scripture, commonly called the Itala.

‡ Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Tom. i. praefat. p. x. et seq.

§ Evangelium Palatinum ineditum, Prolegomena, § 7, p. xvi. et seq.

‖ "In Ipsis autem (Latinis) interpretationibus Itala caeteris praeferatur: nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae."—De Doctr. Christ. Lib. ii. cap. xvi.

cially as he says elsewhere that *unrevised* should yield to *revised* copies.

A good deal of misapprehension has existed in regard to the sense of *Itala* or *the Italic revision*. It does not mean *one particular* Latin version from among many other distinct ones of the same kind and in the same language. Neither does it apply to the whole mass of Latin biblical text prior to the time of Jerome. The old Latin version which was made in northern Africa in the second century should not be called the *Itala* or *Italic version*. Augustine's use of it is more restricted, for he applies it to a certain *revision* of the *versio vetus* or old Latin—that revision which circulated in northern Italy—the Italian province of which Milan was the metropolis. To this form of the text the African father applies the character, "*est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae.*" The Italic revision was distinguished for the *closeness of its renderings* and the *perspicuity of its style*. As the version circulated in its native country, northern Africa, we have reason to believe that it possessed a certain rude simplicity. It was literal and bold in style, passing into grammatical inaccuracy in numerous instances. It was barbarous enough at first; it had contracted worse features afterwards. Its text had been disfigured and corrupted.

The works of Blanchini and Sabatier have done much towards making us acquainted with the MSS. of the old Latin. Some of Tischendorf's publications have also contributed to the same object. A good many of the codices have thus been collated or published, the *most important* of which are the following:—

IN THE GOSPELS.

Codex Vercellensis (cod. Verc. *a* of Lachmann and Tischendorf). This ancient codex belongs to the fourth century, and is supposed to have been written by the hand of Eusebius of Vercelli. It has now many chasms. The text was first

printed by J. A. Irico at Milan in 1749, 4to, and was subsequently incorporated by Blanchini into *Evangeliarum Quadruplex*, where it occupies the left-hand page. There is a description of the MS. in that work, and a fac-simile specimen.

Cod. Veronensis (cod. Ver. *b* of Lachmann and Tischendorf). This codex belongs to the fourth or fifth century. It has a great number of chasms. The text was published by Blanchini in the work already mentioned where it occupies the right-hand page. The MS. is also described there, and a fac-simile specimen given.

Cod. Palatinus Vindobonensis (*e* of Tischendorf). This MS. contains the gospels of John and Luke nearly entire. Almost the half of Matthew is wanting. Nearly six chapters of Mark remain. It is supposed to belong to the fourth or fifth century; and the text was published by Tischendorf in 1847 in his "Evangelium Palatinum ineditum."

Cod. Brixianus (*f* of Tischendorf). This codex belongs to the sixth century. It is described in the work of Blanchini, where its text is published below that of the cod. Ver. or *b*.

Codices Corbejenses (ff^1 and ff^2 of Tischendorf). Two of these which are very ancient have been used, by the aid of the publications of Martianay, Blanchini, and Sabatier.

Codices Sangermanenses (g^1 and g^2 of Tischendorf). Two of these which are also very old have been employed for critical purposes. The readings of the first were given as regards Matthew's gospel by Martianay and Blanchini; of the second as well as the first in relation to the four gospels by Sabatier.

Cod. Claromontanus (*h* of Tischendorf). This MS. is now in the Vatican Library and is doubtless of a very great age. It contains the gospel according to Matthew, with several chasms. Sabatier gave excerpts from it, and Angelo Mai afterwards published its text in the third volume of his "Scriptor. Veterum nova collectio."

Cod. Vindobonensis (*i* of Tischendorf). This MS. which

has been assigned to the fifth century contains fragments of the gospels by Luke and Mark. The text was published entire by Alter and Paulus.

Cod. Bobbiensis (*k* of Tischendorf). This MS. is now at Turin, and belongs to the fifth century. It contains fragments of the gospels by Matthew and Mark. The text was best published by Tischendorf in 1847 in the Wiener Jahrbücher.

Cod. Cantabrigiensis (*d* of Lachmann and Tischendorf). This is a Greek-Latin MS. of the gospels, Acts, and third epistle of John, supposed to belong to the sixth century. The Latin is mutilated in some parts, and some lessons are by a more recent hand. A splendid fac-simile of the text was published by Kipling.

Cod. Rhedigerianus (*l* of Tischendorf). This MS. contains the four gospels, with a considerable deficiency in that of John. It has been assigned to the seventh century. Schulz first collated, described, and applied it to the criticism of the text, in the third edition of Griesbach.

Cod. Colbertinus (*c* of Lachmann and Tischendorf). This MS. belongs to the eleventh century. Its text was published by Sabatier.

IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The chief MSS. hitherto used have been—

The *Cod. Cantabrigiensis* or *d* already noticed.

Cod. Laudianus (*e* of Lachmann and Tischendorf). This is a Greek-Latin MS. in the Bodleian Library. It is assigned by Tischendorf to the end of the sixth century, and the text was published by Hearne at Oxford in 1715.

Cod. Bobbiensis (*k* of Tischendorf). Now at Vienna, a MS. assigned to the fifth century by Tischendorf. It contains no more than a few fragments of the Acts discovered in a rescript MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna and edited by Tischendorf.

IN THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

Cod. Corbejensis (*ff*[1] of Tischendorf). A MS. already referred to as containing Matthew's gospel. It has also the epistle of James. The text was edited by Martianay, and afterwards by Sabatier.

Cod. Bobbiensis (*k*). This is the same just referred to as containing fragments of the Acts. It contains besides a few fragments of James's epistle and the first of Peter.

IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

Cod. Claromontanus (*f* of Lachmann; *d* of Tischendorf). An important MS. attributed by Tischendorf to the end of the sixth century. It contains the Greek text, as well as the Latin version. Tischendorf has published the whole MS. very accurately.

Cod. Sangermanensis (*ff* of Lachmann; *e* of Tischendorf), now at Petersburgh. This is a Greek-Latin MS. The text was published by Sabatier.

Cod. Boernerianus (*g* of Lachmann and Tischendorf), now in Dresden. It is a Greek-Latin MS. supposed to belong to the ninth century. The whole was published by Matthaei, at Meissen, A.D. 1791.

Cod. Guelpherbytanus (Guelph.) containing a few fragments of the epistle to the Romans appended to the text of the Gothic version, published from the rescript leaves by Knittel.

Griesbach in his second edition quoted readings from twenty-five MSS. of the versio vetus; but seven of them, as he himself states, are rather MSS. of the Vulgate or Jerome's revision. This leaves eighteen. Two additional ones were cited by Schulz in the third edition of Griesbach's first volume; to which Scholz added three *apparently*, but only two *in reality*, because one of his three belongs to the Vulgate, not the

vetus. Tischendorf used several other important ones which were either unknown or unexamined before, so that the list has been considerably enlarged since Griesbach's time, and may without doubt be greatly increased hereafter; for it is known that many codices of the old Latin exist in European libraries —codices that have not been sought out and brought forth from their hiding places.

It is of more importance however to *classify* than simply *to enumerate* the Latin MSS., for they are clearly capable of *classification* according to *the form of text* they exhibit.

1. The old Latin or *versio vetus* as found in codices Vercellensis, Veronensis, and Colbertinus. These represent the *unrevised* version in the oldest state it can be obtained in.

2. The *Italic revision* of the Latin, to which alone Augustine refers. This is found in the codex Brixianus.

[3. Jerome's revision, which was probably in part a new version. To this we shall refer hereafter.]

4. A revision in which the Greek MSS. that resemble B. C. L. were followed. This is found in the fragments of codex Bobbiensis, not as published by Fleck, for he has given the readings most inaccurately, but as published in the Wiener Jahrbücher by Tischendorf.

There are also MSS. containing a *mixed* text, which is commonly a modification of the text found in cod. Brixianus, such as the codex Boernerianus. There are also MSS. of Jerome's revision in which older readings and additions are found as cod. Emmerami. These are the result of the existence of the various classes.

It was after the first class that Lachmann so eagerly sought, that he might shew the version in its original African state as correctly as possible. But he was only able to obtain a few ancient copies of this kind. The second class or *Itala* was conformed to the Greek MSS. then becoming current, such as the Gothic commonly agrees with, or the Constantinopolitan

family of Griesbach. The third or Jerome's revision follows, as we learn from himself, the same kind of MSS. as the versio vetus was at first made from, that is, the western recension of Griesbach. As to the form of the versio vetus in the copies of it current at Rome when Jerome undertook his revision, it is best seen in the commentaries of Victorinus bishop of Rome in the fourth century. The fourth class is conformed to the Alexandrine MSS. of Griesbach, or such as were used for the Memphitic version.

JEROME'S REVISION OR THE VULGATE.

To remedy the confusion which had been introduced into the text of the old Latin, Jerome was requested by Damasus bishop of Rome to revise it after the Greek original. The task was not undertaken without serious misgivings, because he foresaw that all the moderation and caution which he might employ would not suffice to prevent odium. Accordingly he did not deem it necessary or wise to depart very far from the prevailing text of the Latin translation. Agreeably to his own statement he took for the basis of his revision the most esteemed copies of the time—those of Origen, Pierius, Eusebius—which came nearer the Latin text than others, and followed them only where he found the Latin manifestly erroneous. Hence he allowed everything to remain which he could not directly pronounce to be false, though he might have been able to put a better in place of it. He refrained from making much innovation. As many changes as he thought desirable and would have preferred, were not made. He did not follow out his own convictions and preferences in the task of revision.* Hence

* "Novum opus me facere cogis ex Veteri ut post exemplaria scripturarum toto orbe dispersa, quasi quidem arbiter sedeam, et quia inter se variant, quae sunt illa quae cum Graecis consentiant veritate decernam. Pius labor sed periculosa praesumptio judicare de caeteris ipsum ab omnibus judicandum ; senis mutare linguam et canescentem jam mundum

his *commentaries* exhibit departures from the version as he himself improved it. *In them* we may perceive his best judgment relative to the readings of the Latin text.

Take the following as a specimen of the changes he made:—

Old Latin.	*Jerome's revision.*
Matt. vi. 11. Panem quotidianum.	Panem supersubstantialem.
vii. 12. Ut faciant vobis homines bona.	Ut faciant vobis homines.
Matt. xxi. 31. Et dicunt ei : novissimus.*	Et dicunt ei : primus.
xxiv. 36. Nec filius.	(Omitted).
Matt. xi. 2. Discipulos suos.	Duos de discipulis suis.
v. 22. Sine causa.	(Omitted).

But it must not be supposed from the preface to the four gospels addressed to Damasus, as might perhaps be inferred from itself, that the revision of Jerome extended to the gospels alone.† He merely *began* with them. The other parts fol-

ad initia retrahere parvulorum ; quis enim doctus pariter et indoctus, cum in manus volumen assumserit et a saliva, quam semel imbibit viderit discrepare, quod lectitat non statim erumpat in vocem me falsarium, me clamitans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veteribus libris addere, mutare, corrigere," &c.—Praef. in iv. Evang. ad Damasum.

"Codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed et veterum, nec quae multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum, quae sensum videbantur mutare, correctis, reliqua manere pateremur, ut fuerunt."—*Ibid.*

"Praetermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio, quibus utique nec in toto veteri instrumento post LXX. interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in novo profuit emendasse."—*Ibid.*

* Here Sabatier has *primus*. But we believe that the other is the true reading, since it is found in the codices Vercellensis, Veronensis, Corbejensis, San-germanensis and other ancient MSS. But the cod. Brixianus has *primus*.—See Blanchini's Evangel. Quadruplex.

† "Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quatuor Evangelia . . . . . codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed veterum, nec qui multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent."—Praef. ad Damas.

lowed. Elsewhere he speaks expressly of the whole New Testament as having been corrected;* and complains of those who in the Pauline epistles preferred the old vicious Latin translation to his new and revised text.†

The four gospels were completed and published in the year 384. After this part was finished, he proceeded to the remaining books, in which he followed the same method as in the gospels, correcting here and there from the Greek, but leaving most part of the text untouched. The multiplicity of his engagements at Rome during the three years or more he spent there at this time 382-386, proves that he could not have devoted much time to the revision of the New Testament. The latter part of the work we know to have been completed before he left the city; for this is evident from the epistle to Marcella (102) written in 385 or the commencement of 386, in which he strongly inveighs against the *biped asses*, as he calls them, (bipedes aselli), who blamed him for his emendations in the gospels and preferred the old Latin.

A few examples of his recension in the remainder of the New Testament may be given —

	Old Latin.	*Jerome's revision.*
Acts xiii. 18.	Nutrivit eos.	Mores eorum sustinuit.
xv. 29.	Observantes vos ipsos, bene agetis.	Custodientes vos, bene agetis.
Gal. v. 7.	Quis vos impedivit veritati non obedire ? Nemini consenseritis.	(Nemini consenseritis is omitted).
Eph. i. 9.	Placitum.	Bonum placitum.
i. 11.	Vocati sumus.	Sorte vocati sumus.
i. 14.	Adoptionis.	Adquisitionis.
19.	Vobis qui credidistis.	Nos qui credidimus.
1 Tim. i. 15.	Humanus sermo.	Fidelis sermo.
iii. 2.	Docibilem.	Doctorem.

* "Novum Testamentum Graecae fidei reddidi."—Catal. scriptt. eccles.

† Epist. ad Marcellam, 102, or as it is now, xxvii.

	Old Latin.	*Jerome's revision.*
1 Tim. v. 19.	Adversus presbyterum accusationem ne receperis.	Nisi sub duobus, et tribus testibus (added).
Eph. iv. 14.	Remedium.	Circumventionem.
vi. 11.	Remedium diaboli.	Insidias diaboli.*

What Jerome was afraid of actually came to pass. Neither the name of Damasus nor the obvious want of such a revision contributed to introduce the amended text into the western church generally in the century it appeared in. Augustine himself showed a disinclination to welcome it; and in Rome both the old Latin and the improved text were employed together for a long time. But the reputation of the latter grew with time. Its value was gradually recognised, till at last it came to be universally adopted. After this time, by way of distinguishing the amended from the older text, the name *versio vulgata* or *communis* was attributed to the former. When therefore we now speak of *the Vulgate* in relation to the New Testament, we mean Jerome's revised edition of the ancient Latin version used by the Latin fathers—the text of the latter corrected by the aid of ancient Greek MSS. A writer in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman biography, says both erroneously and unintelligibly, "The New Testament is a translation formed out of the old translations carefully compared and corrected from the original Greek of Jerome." †

The version has not remained in the state in which it came from the hand of Jerome. Besides the changes which are unavoidable in the course of transcription for centuries, an early intermixture of the two texts took place. Cassiodorus compared again (after A.D. 550) the older text with that of Jerome, placing both in parallel columns. We are informed by Blan-

* See Mill's Prolegomena in N. T. § 863, et seq. where however there are many errors. † Vol. ii. p. 466.

chini,* that there is a MS. in the Vatican (No. 7016) in which the Vulgate of Jerome has been industriously mixed with the old Latin version.

We have already spoken of critical revisions of the Vulgate by Alcuin, Lanfranc, Cardinal Nicolaus, and the so-called Correctoria. The description given applies alike to the Old and New Testament parts of the Vulgate. The chief editions have also been noticed and described, and all proceedings of interest or importance relating to the entire version.

Before leaving the Vulgate we may allude to a circumstance which has not been sufficiently perceived or attended to in connection with its history and character. In A.D. 386 or 387, above a year after Jerome had gone over all the New Testament, appeared his commentaries on the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, Philemon, in which he reviewed and amended in different places what he had previously left untouched. And because it was seen that these emendations differed considerably from the text of the Vulgate, some thought that the Latin version we now have and call the Vulgate is not that which was either edited or amended by Jerome.† But this is incorrect. Had Jerome undertaken a thorough correction of the old Latin translation, the view proposed would have been plausible; but such was not the fact. In revising the latter part of the New Testament, he followed the same rule as he had done in the case of the gospels. He merely removed the most palpable mistakes, those which seemed to alter the sense, leaving others as they were. Not a few were allowed to remain, lest offence should be given. But after Jerome had published his edition of the old Latin, it was

* Evangeliarum Quadruplex, vol. ii. pars 2. post DCIV. cod. XXXIV. "Versio est ex Itala atque ex Hieronymiana versione mixta."

† Estius Comment. in ep. ad Ephes. i. 10.

still in his power to note and correct such faults as had occurred to him perhaps from repeated perusals of the Latin text; and he did this in the commentaries on the epistles already mentioned, as well as in his commentary on Matthew, published in A.D. 398.*

These remarks will shew that the Latin text, as it proceeded from Jerome's hands at first, and as it was *afterwards* explained and commented on, is not always the same. The one shews what he thought it prudent to do with it under the circumstances in which he was placed at Rome, and while Damasus lived. The other shews his later and better ideas respecting the readings of it. Still however, in endeavouring to restore the text of the Vulgate to its original state as it came from the hands of Jerome himself, we should not put into the text, by the aid of his commentaries, what he himself did not actually put or leave in it. Where he repeats and explains in his commentaries the same readings as those occurring in the text itself just as he revised it, we have ample ground for believing that the genuine readings are before us; but where he changes a word or words in his annotations, departing from his former sentiments, or expressing perhaps what he did not before act upon, we must not put these new readings into the text. Jerome himself did not so place them. They ought to stand beside the text, as various readings exhibiting the reviser's maturest ideas of the emendation required.

The Vulgate, as it is now called, containing Jerome's Latin version of the Old Testament, and his revision of the old Latin text in the New Testament, is best represented in its original condition just as he left it, in the codex Amiatinus, as far as it can be represented by one MS. No one probably exhibits it so well as it is there printed. This is the most

* See Mill's Prolegomena in N. T. § 867.

valuable one yet known, whose text has been printed by Tischendorf. It is also well given in the tenth and eleventh volumes of Vallarsi's edition of Jerome's works.*

But this Hieronymian revision is of so great importance that we must not dismiss it without giving some account of the chief manuscript copies of it that are known. We attach very high value to it, and therefore regard its best codices as worthy of notice. Every thing that contributes to elicit its primitive readings should be carefully noticed. In doing this we are supplying the class of Latin MSS. already described as No. 3.

There are many ancient MSS. of the Vulgate which have been applied to the criticism of the text. It is necessary to do so not only because the printed editions are so defective and imperfect representatives of the text which Jerome revised, but because ancient MS. copies of it are so abundant. Nothing is more certain than that both the papal editions of Sixtus and Clement VIII. differ from the true Hieronymian text, as is proved by very ancient MSS. Hence it is equally desirable and necessary to have recourse to the latter. Indeed the printed editions of the Vulgate are of little use for critical purposes.

Cod. Amiatinus (L. of Lachmann ; *am.* Tischendorf.) This MS. is now in the Laurentian library at Florence, and was written about the year 541. A collation of it was published by F. F. Fleck in 1840. Afterwards it was more accurately examined by Tischendorf, and excerpts made from it which are quoted in his second edition of the Greek Testament. Since then he has published the entire text. It contains both the Old and New Testaments.

Cod. Fuldensis (F. of Lachmann ; *fuld.* Tischendorf.) This also appears to belong to the sixth century. It was used by Lachmann and Buttmann in their edition of the Greek Testa-

* See Eichhorn's Einleit. in das neue Testament, vol. iv. p. 376, et seq.

ment and of the Hieronymian version, and contains all the New Testament, except that it has the four gospels in a harmony divided into canons and numbers. The best description of the MS. is that given long ago by Schannat.

Cod. Toletanus (*tol.*) This codex is at Toledo, as the name implies, and is written in Gothic letters. A collation of it was published by Blanchini. It contains both the Old and New Testaments.

Other MSS. containing parts of the Vulgate or Jerome's revised text have been used in the critical editions of Griesbach, Scholz, and Tischendorf, such as the cod. *Emmerami* written in the ninth century and described by Sanftl; *Forojuliensis* published by Blanchini; *Fossatensis* in the work of Sabatier; *S. Gatiani* of the eighth century, in Sabatier and Blanchini; *Harlejanus* of the seventh century, in Griesbach's Symbolae Criticae; *Ingolstadiensis* of the seventh century, in Tischendorf's second edition of the Greek Testament, &c. &c. all relating to the gospels; *Demidovianus* containing the Old and New Testaments out of which Matthaei published the text of the Acts, epistles, and Apocalypse, &c. &c. *Luxoviensis* a lectionary described and collated by Mabillon and Sabatier, &c. &c. But for a particular account of these we must refer to the works of Sabatier, Blanchini, Tischendorf, and others mentioned in the Prolegomena of the critical editions of the New Testament by Griesbach, Scholz, and Tischendorf.

The Latin version in its *antehieronymian* as well its *hieronymian* form, is of great use in the department of New Testament criticism. Perhaps none other surpasses here. We should scarcely prefer the old Syriac. It points out the readings of Greek MSS. of greater antiquity than any now existing. The more ancient the Greek MSS. the closer is their agreement with it. Undoubtedly the true Hieronymian revision of it is of most service in indicating the *best* readings.

But *all* the forms of the Latin deserve the most careful observation.

Notwithstanding the very great importance of the version before us, it has not yet been used as much and as efficiently as it ought. Indeed its proper value has only *begun* to be appreciated. Bentley long ago perceived its true worth; as his "proposals for a new edition of the Greek Testament and Latin version" amply attest. It will not perhaps be amiss to cite a passage or two from that consummate critic's "proposals."

"The author of this edition, observing that the printed copies of the New Testament, both of the original Greek and Antient Vulgar Latin, were taken from MSS. of no great antiquity, such as the first editors could then procure; and that now by God's providence there are MSS. in Europe, (accessible though with great charge) above a thousand years old in both languages; believes he may do good service to common Christianity, if he publishes a new edition of the Greek and Latin, not according to the recent and interpolated copies, but as represented in the most antient and venerable MSS. in Greek and Roman Capital letters. 'The Author revolving in his mind some passages of St. Hierom; where he declares, that (without making a New Version) he adjusted and reform'd the whole Latin Vulgate to the best Greek Exemplars, that is, to those of the famous Origen; and another passage, where he says, that a verbal or literal interpretation out of Greek into Latin is not necessary, except in the Holy Scriptures, *Ubi ipse verborum ordo mysterium est*, where the very order of the words is a mystery; took thence the hint, that if the oldest copies of the Original Greek and Hierom's Latin were examined and compared together, perhaps they would be still found to agree both in words and order of words. And upon making the Essay, he has succeeded in his conjecture, beyond his expectation or even his hopes.'

"The Author believes that he has retriev'd (except in very

few places) the true Exemplar of Origen, which was the standard to the most learned of the fathers at the time of the council of Nice and two centuries after. And he is sure that the Greek and Latin MSS. by their mutual assistance, do so settle the original text to the smallest nicety; as cannot be perform'd now in any Classic Author whatever: and that out of a labyrinth of thirty thousand various readings, that croud the pages of our present best editions, all put upon equal credit to the offence of many good persons; this clue so leads and extricates us that there will scarce be two hundred out of so many thousands that can deserve the least consideration."

In modern times Lachmann was the first who elevated the Latin version to its proper place and authority in his large edition of the Greek Testament, where he prints Jerome's revision along with the original Greek, from the oldest and best sources he could find. In this respect he only trod in the steps of his master Bentley. The edition of Lachmann greatly influenced Tischendorf in regard to the Latin translation; and he has accordingly done much to promote our knowledge of its old MSS. By means of his investigations, it might be more correctly edited now than it was by Lachmann. Critical editors will still find the field far from exhausted. It deserves to be well cultivated.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON VERSIONS.

It is high time that the number of versions applied to the textual criticism of the New Testament should be reduced. No real benefit has accrued from extending the range of investigation in this quarter. Rather has there been disadvantage; for the wideness of the field has made it much more difficult to be satisfactorily treated. There are several versions which have encumbered, not promoted the science. We should therefore cut them off altogether. They should be left out of

account in future researches. The Arabic versions of the New Testament ought to be neglected. They are useless. The same may be said of the Persian. In like manner the Georgian is worthless. The Armenian though ancient has yielded no fruit. It has now no ancient MSS. to present its original form—a most important consideration, since it has suffered extensive interpolation from the Latin. The Slavonic is too recent to be of much use, however highly extolled and defended it has been by Dobrowsky. Doubtless it has good readings generally, if it be true, as has been affirmed, that three-fourths of those adopted by Griesbach are contained in it; but the suspicion is still strong of its being altered from the Latin; and the good readings of Griesbach are equally found in older versions, so that the Slavonic is not needed for them. Subtracting these versions there remain the Syriac, Latin, Egyptian, Æthiopic, and Gothic. Confining the attention to these, let critics investigate their nature and collate their texts most accurately.

It were better that *one* competent scholar should take up *one* of them, and work at it for years till he were satisfied that he had done as much for its elucidation in a critical view as his resources allowed. The most ancient should be first examined. The Latin is as yet imperfectly known; and here one man could scarcely traverse the wide field, unless he were placed in very favourable circumstances. The old Syriac needs to be re-edited from ancient copies which we know to be available. The same holds good of the others we have mentioned.

In thus rejecting the junior versions, with which critical editors appear only to have embarrassed their editions, we should be coming back towards the principle proposed to himself by the sagacious Bentley:—"To confirm," says he, "the lections which the author places in the text, he makes use of the old versions, Syriac, Coptic, Gothic, and Æthiopic, and of

all the fathers, Greeks and Latins, within the first five centuries."

We conclude this part of the subject with a few hints and cautions. We can scarcely call them *rules*.

1. Those versions only have a critical use in restoring the original, which were made directly from the original Greek. Such as were derived from other versions shew the readings of the parent not of the original texts.

2. The critic should procure the text of the version he means to use critically edited and amended. This will appear necessary when it is stated that evident blunders are still contained in most of the editions. Thus in the Peshito, Luke ii. 10, τῷ λαῷ, ܠܥܠܡܐ *mundo*, instead of ܠܥܡܐ *populo*. See also iv. 19; Romans xi. 27; Colos. i. 29, ii. 16; 2 Thes. ii. 7; 2 Peter ii. 1, 17, 18.* The same is the case with the Æthiopic, the Vulgate, and others, as has been shewn by Michaelis.

3. As most of them have not yet been edited in the manner we could wish to see—as they have not been always printed from the best and most ancient sources, good and old MSS. should be employed and not merely printed copies. This however is beyond the reach of many.

4. He who employs a version in criticism should be well acquainted with the language of it.

5. After procuring a version in the most correct state possible, as near as it can be to the original form, the critic should not trust to the ordinary Latin interpretation that may accompany it, else he will be misled. By this confidence Mill was often deceived.

6. The characteristic peculiarities of the version should be perceived and attended to. Every translator has a method of his own which ought to be noticed, else mistakes will be committed in extracting various readings from his work.

7. Agreeably to the preceding sentiment, it must be con-

* Michaelis, De variis lectionibus Novi Testamenti, § 66.

sidered whether the translator has inserted his own explanation, rather than a fair version of the original.

8. Let it be observed whether he has written ambiguously, or so that it cannot be clearly determined from his version what stood in the MS. or MSS. before him.

9. It should be seen whether the translator has erred either through the mistake of the MS. or MSS. he used, or through his own ignorance of the language he had to do with, or through negligence.

10. The best versions of the New Testament are the old Syriac and the Latin. The most ancient, literal, and faithful are the best for critical purposes.

11. Versions belonging to one class or family are considered to have no more than one voice in favour of a reading.

12. No reading derived from versions alone, wanting the support of other ancient witnesses, is likely to be genuine; but yet the agreement of ancient versions and fathers in a reading where most MSS. differ, throws suspicion on its genuineness in the latter documents.

CHAPTER XIX.

MSS. OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

A SECOND source of critical correction consists of MSS., as has been already stated.

MSS. of the Greek Testament may be divided into *uncial* and *cursive*, agreeably to the forms of the letters employed, or, to use modern language, into such as are written with *capital* and *small* letters. This seems to us the best and most convenient division. But Hug, and others after him, arranges them in three classes; first, such as preceded *stichometry;* secondly, *stichometrical;* thirdly, those written after *stichometry* had been laid aside.

Very few MSS. contained at first the entire New Testament. But the two most ancient and valuable ones termed the *Vatican* (B.) and Alexandrine (A.) did so. So too among the Butler MSS. in the British Museum, that splendid MS. in folio which purports to have been written by Methodius the monk in the fourteenth century (No. 11, 837).

The whole of the New Testament was commonly divided into three or four parts, viz. the Gospels; the Acts and Epistles; the Apocalypse; or the Gospels, the Acts and Catholic epistles, the Pauline epistles, the Apocalypse. Some have the Acts alone. Others contain the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. Those containing the four gospels are the most numerous, because that part of the New Testament was most read. Such

as have the Pauline epistles are also numerous. Those containing the Acts and Catholic epistles are many, but not equal in number to the Pauline. Such again as exhibit the Apocalypse alone are few, because that book was seldomest read.

Entire copies of the New Testament were made up for the most part out of MSS. containing several parts or books. Hence the unity of the copy is no proof of the unity of the text. If the codices containing portions of the inspired writings were brought from different countries, and thus transcribed together so as to make one entire MS. the text might naturally partake of different conformations, as is said to be the case in the Alexandrine MS. (A.) The order of the various books differs but little. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, then the Acts; with the Catholic epistles, the Pauline epistles, and the Apocalypse. Sometimes, however, the Pauline epistles come immediately after the gospels, the Acts, Catholic epistles, and Apocalypse following. Latin transcribers placed John after Matthew, so that the two apostles, and the two evangelists Luke and Mark, might stand together respectively.

Few are now complete in all their parts. They are mutilated, wanting leaves at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end. Thus both the Vatican and Alexandrine are now imperfect, which is true of almost all the uncial ones. K. of the gospels or *Codex Cyprius* is one of the few exceptions. It is necessary to attend to the chasms, lest a MS. be quoted for or against a particular reading in a place where it is defective.

MSS. of the Greek Testament are in all forms—folio, quarto, duodecimo. They are also made of different materials, of parchment, cotton paper, paper of linen rags. Parchment was generally employed till the middle ages when paper came more into use. Sometimes MSS. were ornamented in various ways as articles of luxury and show. Costly skins were procured, and elegant letters written upon them. The former were

dyed purple; the latter were adorned with gold and silver. Chrysostom refers to wealthy individuals whose ambition was to possess splendid copies of this sort.* Few such codices however have come down to the present time; and the fragments that do survive shew little of the purple dye, or the silver and gold that must have borne an attractive appearance at first. The value of a MS. does not depend on such things.

The first material employed, viz., the papyrus was soon abandoned. It was frail and perishable. As early as the fourth century the skins of animals had come into its place. This continued till the tenth, when persons began to choose cotton paper, *βόμβυξ*, *charta bombycina.* Such material rendered it no longer necessary to wash out what was first written on the parchment, a practice still common in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in order to write upon the costly material some work more wanted or esteemed at the time.† After cotton paper had been used for a while, linen-rag paper, presenting a still smoother and more accessible material for writing, was adopted and very generally employed in Italy during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries for the New Testament writings.

Black ink was commonly used both in writing the text and in marginal letters. Gold and silver colours were applied merely to the initial letters. The commencement of a new book was also frequently ornamented in the same way. In regard to *lines*, an equal number is regularly contained in each page, standing at equal distances from one another. Hence the copyist must have made an exact measurement before he began to write. At first the lines were filled with letters unconnected and close to each other, without such intervals as the division into words makes, till stichometry did away with the difficulty which these codices must have caused to the reader.

* Homil. xxxi. in Joann.

† See Montfaucon, Palaeographia Graeca, p. 17, et seq.

When the letters constituting each στίχος ceased to make separate lines, and every line began to be filled out without restricting it to a single στίχος, for the purpose of saving space, the old practice was resumed of writing the letters continuously without division, except a point at the end of each στίχος.

Before and after stichometry, each page, if the form presented no obstacle, was divided into two, more rarely into three columns. The latter number appears to point to a higher antiquity, for it comes nearer the Herculaneum rolls. These columns are most frequently occupied by the Greek text alone. Sometimes, however, it is accompanied with a version. That version is commonly the old Latin one which preceded the time of Jerome. Yet the same version as revised by Jerome, or in other words, the Vulgate, is also found along with the original. The version is either in the opposite column, or between the Greek lines. The Memphitic version has also been found along with the Greek. MSS. accompanied with the Latin are called Greek-Latin, *codices bilingues or Graeco-Latini*. The circumstance of their being furnished with the Latin throughout gave rise to a charge against them that the Greek was interpolated from the Latin. This accusation was made by Simon and repeated by Wetstein, to whom it mainly owed its currency for many years. But Semler, Griesbach, and Woide, did much to disprove it, convincing Michaelis that he had once been mistaken in joining with the accusers of such MSS. The charge has been commonly discredited since the various publications of Griesbach. Hence it is a work of supererogation to go over the ground again, for the purpose of refuting an obsolete notion. There is no more cause for stigmatising Greek-Latin codices as *Latinising*, than such as contain the Greek text only. Coincidence with the old Latin version as it existed before Jerome's day, especially in Italy, is so far from being an evidence of corruption from the Latin,

that it shews very ancient and good readings. This old Latin version is a most valuable representative of the early text in the second and third centuries.

Where the contents required some pause or intermission, different expedients were adopted for marking it in the text. Sometimes a new line was begun; sometimes an empty space was left, about as much as might contain a word, between the end of the preceding and beginning of the new paragraph or section; sometimes another colour was chosen for the initial letter of the new chapter, red, blue, or green. But this last was frequently forgotten, because it was not affixed at the time the rest of the text was written but left till a subsequent opportunity.

In the oldest MSS., which reach up to the fourth and fifth centuries, large letters, called since the time of Jerome *uncial*, were used. These are square, upright, regular in their form. They have also been called *round*. The appellation *square* was founded on the very common letters Η, Μ, Ν, Π. *Round* is borrowed from the letters Ε, Θ, Ο, C, Φ, ω. The form of the letters is the same with that found on marbles belonging to the fourth or fifth century, except in regard to Α and Ξ, whose peculiarity of shape at this time may be seen in Montfaucon.* Ε, Σ, Ω, never occur in this form. Of course the height and size of the letters was in proportion to the form of the MS., whether the latter was in folio, quarto, octavo, &c. This character prevailed with little alteration till the eighth and ninth centuries, when the letters C, Ε, Ο, Θ, lost their round form, being made narrower to save space; and others, as Ζ, Ξ, Χ, were lengthened above or below the line. Indeed, the letters were generally made longer and narrower, and sometimes leaning towards the right, sometimes towards the left hand. In this oblong, leaning character, which characterises the eighth and ninth centuries, are written many MSS. intended for ecclesiastical use, especially in choirs,

* Palaeographia, p. 185.

whence they have little signs and lines of various shapes to regulate the inflexions of the voice. Such MSS. exist, belonging not merely to the eighth and ninth centuries, but also to the tenth, and perhaps later.*

Accents and spirits were introduced about the seventh century. They are both in the cod. Claromontanus, though not *a prima manu*.

Two dots are often observed over the letters ι and υ in MSS., thus ϊ ϋ. These were intended to shew that the letters should be taken separately, and not joined with others to form a diphthong. Such points can scarcely be used in determining the age of a MS., least of all do they shew, as has been erroneously said, that a MS. is not more ancient than the eighth century. They are in the Clermont MS., which belongs to the seventh or end of the sixth century.† They are also in MSS. of the fifth and sixth, for example in Z or the Dublin rescript, but at the beginning of words.

Towards the close of the ninth century, the small or cursive writing began, and became general in the tenth. The first MS. that may be said to have the cursive writing has the certain date A.D. 890. Yet the MS. in question (cod. Colbert. 340), containing the lives of the saints for certain months, is not exactly in the common cursive character, for it has *some* traces of resemblance to the older, as indeed might be expected. This MS. alone is sufficient to refute the assertion that a cursive MS. cannot be older than the *tenth* century. Montfaucon gives specimens of two others belonging to the ninth, written in cursive characters.‡ When transcribers were not native Greeks, they adhered more closely and longer to the forms of the uncial letters before them than the native Greeks, who after the ninth century followed the taste of their time in the cursive character.

* Montfaucon, p. 231. † See Montfaucon, p. 33.

‡ Ibid pp. 269, 270.

At first the strokes and twists belonging to the cursive letters made them very like one another, so that it is difficult to ascertain the exact age of MSS. belonging to the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries when they have no date. This similarity in form reaches even into the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; but there *the material* lessens the difficulty of finding out the age.

Particular countries had their own peculiarities in regard to the arrangement of the contents of MSS., the form of the letters and other external particulars. Thus rough, irregularly shaped traces and forms betray one who was not a Greek; whereas simple, uniform, elegant characters shew a Greek copyist in Greek provinces. Letters approaching the Coptic evince an Egyptian transcriber, who had also a peculiar orthography, such as that in B. or the Vatican MS. Characters which resemble the Latin shew a western copyist, for example one belonging to the south of France. Even the different colours and ornamenting of letters may serve to indicate localities.

In the earliest centuries abbreviations were not frequent. They were used only in common words such as, Θ̄C, K̄C, Ī C, X̄C, Ū C, Σ H̄P. And there is little doubt that letters were used for numbers, as in the Apocalypse, xiii. 18.

Correction-marks are numerous. Sometimes the word or words which the copyist or corrector intended to remove had a point over every letter, or a horizontal stroke; sometimes the pen was drawn through them; sometimes the reading condemned was surrounded with points; sometimes it was washed over with a sponge or scraped with a pen-knife, and the right reading written over it. Yet the original reading could be often deciphered either wholly or in part. Many a MS. has passed through the hands of several correctors, who may be distinguished by the peculiarity of their letters, the difference of their ink, and other minute particulars. Many a copy has been

corrected very cursorily. Others have received a thorough revision, and are marked with many corrections even from one hand. Such corrections arose when the copyist transcribed after one exemplar and corrected according to another; when he had several MSS. before him whose texts presented a variety of readings; or when he altered his opinion on certain parts of the text during the progress of his work. Hence none need be surprised to find in MSS. late readings along with ancient ones.

The margin upper and lower is occupied with various things which deserve attention. After the fourth century, the κεφάλαια, τίτλοι, canons of Eusebius, and the Ammonian sections were placed in the margin sometimes partially, sometimes together.

Reading lessons were also marked in the margin by α and τ (ἀρχή and τέλος) occasionally accompanied with a statement of the day on which they should be read. But the majority of marginal remarks consist of scholia, extracts from commentaries, catenae critical and exegetical, as well as corrections of mistakes made in the text. These scholia reach up to Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, though they are mostly drawn from Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and still later authors, such as Isidore of Pelusium, Photius, and Euthymius Zygabenus. There are also musical signs in the margin with red or black ink.

Besides MSS. that contain all or some of the New Testament books, there are others occupied with such select portions as were appointed to be read in the public services of the churches. These are *Lectionaries* or lesson-books. The greater number have lessons or sections from the four gospels and are thence termed εὐαγγελιστάρια, Evangelistaria or Evangeliaria; but others have portions of the Acts and epistles, πραξαποστολοι, *Lectionaria*. In these codices occur the words "Jesus spake" prefixed to the speeches of Christ in the

gospels; ἀδελφοὶ *brethren*, in letters addressed to churches; and τέκνον Τιμόθεε in those to Timothy. Such expressions were merely introductory, and designed for the officiating minister. Yet they were often transferred to other codices, where they have produced various readings, though spurious ones. Matthaei, among all the critical editors, paid most attention to this class of MSS., which is not counted of equal value with MSS. of the same antiquity containing the books of the New Testament complete.*

* Michaelis's Introduction by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 161.

CHAPTER XX.

DESCRIPTION OF THE UNCIAL MSS.

A. The first letter of the alphabet is used to designate the *codex Alexandrinus*, or Alexandrine MS. now in the British Museum. This MS. was presented to Charles the First in 1628 through his ambassador at Constantinople, by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, who brought it immediately from Egypt, whence the name *Alexandrinus*. There is an Arabic subscription on the reverse of the leaf, containing a list of the Old and New Testament books, which says that the book was written by the martyress Thecla; but no reliance can be placed on its accuracy.

The MS. consists of four volumes folio, the first three containing the Old Testament in Greek, the last the New Testament, with the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, and part of the second. In some places of the New Testament it is defective, as at the commencement of Matthew's gospel, for it begins with xxv. 6. It is also deficient in John vi. 50—viii. 52; and from 2 Corinth. iv. 13—xii. 6. Here and there too single letters are wanting, which were cut off by the bookbinder. The various parts of the New Testament follow one another, as they are placed in the editions of Lachmann and Tischendorf.

The letters are uncial, somewhat round, larger and more

elegant than those in B. or the Vatican MS. The words are not separated, there are no accents or marks of aspiration, no trace of stichometry, and the abbreviations are few, and almost always in common words. Semler supposes that the more ancient MS. from which it was copied had a greater number of abbreviations, and that not a few errors committed by the transcriber arose from a false method of deciphering the marks. The initial letters of the different sections into which the text is divided are much larger than the rest, and stand out in the margin of the column.

As to sections, there is an enumeration of the τίτλοι or larger ones at the beginning of each gospel. Their titles or subjects were also given in the upper margin, but most have disappeared thence. The smaller portions or Ammonian sections called κεφάλαια are numbered in the left margin, with the references to the canons of Eusebius. In the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic and Pauline epistles, there are no such chapters as Euthalius made or adopted. But paragraphs and periods are frequent in them, as marked by a new line and a larger letter. In the Acts, the mark of a cross (x) used in two of the gospels at the beginning of the κεφάλαια occurs five times. But Hug contends that the cross marks no such division as a chapter, because it sometimes occurs in the gospels in the middle of a discourse, and even in the middle of a sentence.* In the Apocalypse, the λόγοι and κεφάλαια of Andrew of Cæsarea are not marked. There are also brief inscriptions of the books at the commencement, and subscriptions at the end. The only interpunction used is a simple point, but there is sometimes a vacant space. Other marks, sometimes distinguishing the end of words, especially of monosyllables and proper names, and even the end of syllables, whether in the middle or at the termination of lines, are ' - ' `. Iota or ι has often two dots over it ϊ; and ϒ in the same way ϔ; shewing

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 241.

that they should be separated from other letters. On each page there are two columns.*

The age of this MS. was once much contested, some assigning it to the fourth century as Grabe, Woide, and Schulze; Oudin to the tenth; others to the fifth or beginning of the sixth, as Wetstein and Montfaucon. The various arguments for and against certain dates are anything but conclusive, and not worth repeating. Thus Woide founds an argument respecting the time of its being written on the omission of the Euthalian sections which appeared from the hand of Euthalius in 458. He argues that the MS. was written afterwards, else the Euthalian sections would have been marked in it. But this is inconclusive, for respect must be had to the copy from which the MS. was taken. If the transcriber adhered to the copy before him he might very naturally disregard the innovations or improvements of Euthalius, though they had appeared in the interval between the exemplar and his transcript.

It is highly probable that the codex Alexandrinus was not written earlier than the middle of the fifth century, and that Egypt was the country of its birth. This is gathered from its Egyptian orthography, λημψονται, Mark xii. 40; Phil. iv. 15, λήμψεως; Colos. iii. 24, ἀπολημψεσθε. There are also such Alexandrine forms in the second aorist as αν of the third plural and the like, Acts x. 39, ἀνειλαν, but they are not so common as in the cod. Vaticanus. The interchange of ε and αι, ει and ι, ι and η, ε and ει, κ and γ, ν and μ is very frequent. The confusion of vowels of similar sound is greater than in any other MS.; and all the probabilities of the case are in favour of Egypt.

It has been supposed by Woide, that the MS. was written by two copyists, for he observed a difference of ink and parchment, a difference in the letters, and certain varieties in the beginning of books and sections. †

† See Woidii Notitia codicis Alexandrini, ed. Spohn, p. 23, et seq.

† Notitia, &c. p. 21.

There can be no question that the scribe or scribes were inattentive and careless in their work. The orthographical mistakes are numerous. So too are the omissions, as Spohn has abundantly shewn.* There are a great number of corrections. Many things have been scraped out with a knife, or washed with a sponge. Erasures, single letters omitted and then written above, are by no means uncommon. If there was a reviser distinct from the original scribe, he was equally negligent; for his corrections are sometimes inserted in wrong places. These and other defects which Wetstein clearly perceived long ago, and Woide gently excused, detract considerably from the value of the MS. Yet with all deductions, the codex Alexandrinus is a very important MS. Its antiquity is great, and its readings entitled to considerable attention, inasmuch as they agree generally with other very ancient authorities. In relation to the recension to which its text belongs, a point touched upon by Semler, Griesbach and many others, we need not inquire, as the entire subject of recensions is *now* viewed in a very different light. The MS. is one of the authorities included in the western class, and may therefore be supposed to represent, as far as a single document can do so, the state of the text in Egypt in the fourth century. We lament the fact of the copyist or copyists being so careless and incompetent; for by that means the text has greatly suffered: but there is no remedy for it.

The New Testament was published from this MS. in types made to resemble the writing, by Woide, in a folio volume, 1786, London, to which the editor prefixed valuable prolegomena containing a minute description of the MS. The prolegomena were reprinted at Leipzig by Spohn in 1788, 8vo, with improvements, corrections, and additions. This facsimile volume has superseded subsequent collation, for there is no doubt that it is generally correct. A *few* errors have

* Notitia, &c. p. 186.

been detected in it. Mr. Linnell, however, only found two letters wrongly given in the epistle to the Ephesians, with some inaccuracies in the punctuation. The Old Testament part of the MS. was afterwards published in fac-simile under the editorship of Rev. H. H. Baber, in four volumes folio, or more properly three, for the fourth volume contains notes and prolegomena.

B. *Cod. Vaticanus.* In the Vatican Library there is an ancient MS. numbered 209, which is usually distinguished as *the* Vatican MS. by way of eminence. How it got there, or from what country, is wholly unknown. Its external history is involved in obscurity.

The Vatican MS. or B. consists of one volume small folio or quarto, containing both the Old and New Testaments with various deficiencies. Thus the New Testament is defective from Hebrews ix. 14 to the end of the Apocalypse. Hence the latter part of the epistle to the Hebrews, the two to Timothy, those to Titus and Philemon, with the Apocalypse, are wanting, though they must have been originally there. The order in which the books stand is the gospels, Acts, seven Catholic epistles, and Paul's epistles, including that to the Hebrews. The remainder of the epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse have been supplied by a modern hand in the fifteenth century.

This MS. is of very fine parchment with characters square, beautiful, uniform, and written with great care. The letters are smaller than those of the cod. Alexandrinus, and a shade larger than those in the MS. of Philodemus περὶ μουσικῆς, the first of the Herculaneum rolls which was unfolded. The letters follow each other closely and continuously at equal distances without division of words. Where a complete narrative terminates, or there is a change from one subject to another, a space is left of the breadth of half a letter and sometimes of an entire one. The initial letters do not differ from the rest;

but larger initial letters were written over the original ones by a *later* hand. There are three columns in each page.

Long ago, the characters had faded so much that it was necessary to retouch them with new ink. In the course of time another person undertook to remedy the faintness of the second application of ink in various places. Hence the original characters appear only in places where the calligraphist wrote some things badly or twice.

There is no interpunction in the MS. Even where a very small space is left at the end of a discourse or subject, there is no trace of a point. Those who retouched the characters with new ink sometimes ventured to insert points; but it would appear that the original scribe did not. Yet these points seldom occur. Hug observes that there are but four in the first six chapters of Matthew. In the Acts they occur oftener.*

It was formerly a matter of doubt whether the codex had at first accents and marks of aspiration. The fac-simile given of it by Blanchini† represented it without both; and Montfaucon expressly affirmed that it had no accents.‡ Birch§ asserted that it had both, and blamed Blanchini for neglecting to mark the fact. How was the testimony of these eye-witnesses to be reconciled? After a very minute examination of the MS. with and without glasses, Hug shewed that the accents and spirits were added by a later hand. Wherever the original writing appeared without receiving later touches of ink, no trace of accents or spirits was visible. The MS. has *inscriptions* or titles to the books, and *subscriptions*. The former are very simple, and found at the top of the page, κατὰ Μαθθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, &c. The subscriptions are nothing but repetitions of the titles; what is additional having proceeded

* De Antiquitate codicis Vaticani, p. 98 of the reprint in Penn's Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant.

† Evangeliarium Quadruplex, vol. i. at p. CDXCII.

‡ Bibliotheca bibliothecarum, vol. i. p. 3. § Prolegomena in N. T. p. 15.

from a second hand. Thus πρὸς Ρωμαίους is the genuine subscription of the epistle to the Romans, to which was afterwards appended ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Κορίνθου. It should be observed, that the subscriptions are not the Euthalian ones.

In the gospels, the Ammonian sections and the canons of Eusebius are entirely wanting. The MS. has divisions of its own, of which there are 170 in Matthew's gospel, 72 in Mark, 152 in Luke, and 80 in John. The Acts of the apostles has the ancient Egyptian church lessons, which, according to Euthalius, were 36; and so they are here. A later hand, however, appended another division of the book consisting of 69 chapters; but this is not the Euthalian. The same observations apply to the Catholic epistles, in which neither the original nor the later division given in the MS. coincides with that of Euthalius.

The divisions of the Pauline epistles are quite singular. All together are considered as one book, and the sections numbered throughout, having the number 64 at the place where the MS. stops. These numbers also shew that the epistle to the Hebrews originally stood after that to the Galatians, because the epistle to the Galatians concludes with the 59th section and that to the Hebrews begins with the 60th; the second to the Thessalonians ending with the 93d. Hence it has been inferred that the transposition of the epistle to the Hebrews from its place after the Galatian one to the end of the second to the Thessalonians, had been made so recently that the division of sections was not altered.

As to the orthography of the MS. it is very correct. There is no confounding of vowels similar in sound except that ει is often used for ι. *Nu ephelkustic* is often added, where grammarians would pronounce it improper. But modern rules of grammar are of no consequence in judging of a very ancient document like the present. Its country is shewn to be Egypt by such forms as συλλημψη, λημψεσθε, λημφθησεται, λημφθεντα, &c.

The second aorist and imperfect have also the form of the first aorist, as εξηλθατε, εισηλθατε, ειπαν, ηλθαν, ειδαν. Such peculiarities are Alexandrine, occurring besides in Coptic or Graeco-coptic documents, and an inscription on the Memnon of Thebes.

The antiquity of the MS. is very great. For determining it a number of points must be brought together, such as the near affinity of the character to that in the Herculaneum rolls; the twofold retouching of the letters; the continuous sequence of words without any separation or interpunction; the accents added by a later hand with other ink; *the form* of the MS. approaching to the more ancient rolls, and the number of columns adapted to it; the height, breadth, and intervals of those columns resembling very much the rolls of Herculaneum. These particulars carry up the codex to an age beyond any other biblical MS. known to exist. Other indications of its antiquity are found in the additions to the subscriptions put by a second hand which were still prior to those of Euthalius; the absence of the Ammonian sections which came into general use at the close of the fourth century; the twofold division into sections in the Acts and Catholic epistles, the second itself differing from that of Euthalius; the singular distribution of the Pauline epistles into sections, as if they were but one book; the position of the epistle to the Hebrews, which had been shifted from its place after the Galatian epistle quite recently, and put after the Thessalonian epistles where it usually was in the time of Athanasius; and the omission of the words εν Εφεσω from the text at the commencement of the epistle to the Ephesians, though they are subjoined *a prima manu* in the margin, agreeably to the assertion of Basil that those words were wanting in ancient MSS. Relying upon such marks, Hug assigns the MS. to the first half of the fourth century,* an opinion in which Tischendorf coincides. Blanchini had formerly referred it to the fifth century, and Montfaucon to the fifth or sixth.

* Commentatio, &c. p. 112.

The internal excellence of the readings is in harmony with the accuracy of the copyist in giving a faithful transcript of his exemplar. The text is free on the whole from the arbitrary interpolations and corrections found in some other MSS.

It is useless at the present day to repeat the brief description of the New Testament part of this MS. given by Zacagni in 1698, in his Collectanea Monumentorum, and extracted by Mill as well as Wetstein in their prolegomena to the Greek Testament. It would be equally unprofitable at the present time to cite the words of Paul Bombasius in an epistle to Erasmus, A.D. 1521, the unsatisfactory notices of it by Erasmus, or the words of the editors of the Septuagint which was taken from it under the auspices of Sixtus the fifth. Such particulars are collected by Wetstein in his prolegomena. The first tolerably good description of it was given by Birch; though it was by no means so ample and accurate as might have been expected. Hug's *commentatio* published in 1810, and since reprinted by Granville Penn in "Annotations to the book of the New Covenant," contains the minutest and most accurate description of it which has been given. What is wanted is a *thorough* and *accurate collation* of it. This were a most desirable thing. At present, however, there is not much prospect of obtaining such a collation, since individuals are only allowed to *look at* it. In the meantime, critical editors must rely upon the three existing collations of it made by Bartolocci, Bentley (or rather for him), and Birch. The collation of the first is preserved among the MSS. in the Bibliotheque du Roi at Paris. It is very imperfect. The second, made for Bentley by Mico an Italian, is the most complete, notwithstanding all its imperfections. This collation transcribed by Woide was published by Ford in 1799, at the end of the work entitled, *Appendix ad editionem Novi Testamenti Graeci e codice MS. Alexandrino a Car. God. Woide descripti*, &c. Birch examined all except the gospels of Luke and John,

where he used Bentley's collation. But his collation is hasty and inaccurate. With all the discrepancies of these three, Tischendorf and even Muralt had to rely upon them, except in the few cases where they obtained an opportunity themselves of examining various passages in the MS.

Much has been said, and a good deal written, about the publication of the Vatican MS. by Angelo Mai. But very little is known of such an edition. One thing is pretty certain, that no edition of it engraved on copper plates in *fac-simile* letters is in progress. The words of Tischendorf, though indefinite enough, set aside the notion of a *fac-simile* with types cut to resemble the letters. After saying that Mai showed him in 1843 five printed volumes, the fifth containing the New Testament, he adds, "Quae editio, brevi opinor proditura, *quanquam non erit ejusmodi ut ipsum codicem accuratissime exprimat*, magnopere tamen varias codicis collationes supplebit."* What has been prepared by Mai is an edition of the text printed like Tischendorf's *codex Ephraemi rescriptus.* We know no better fac-simile of B. than that given by Blanchini.† Tischendorf's‡ contains but a few words.

B. *Cod. Vaticanus*, No. 2066, formerly *Basilianus* 105. This folio MS. contains the Apocalypse entire, besides various works of the fathers, as homilies of Basil and Gregory Nyssene. The Apocalypse stands among these homilies.

The Greek text has the accents and spirits *a prima manu.* The use of them is continued and tolerably accurate. It formerly belonged to the monks of the order of St. Basil in Rome, whence it was transferred to the Vatican.

Blanchini was the first who drew attention to this MS. and gave a fac-simile of it.§ It was collated for Wetstein by

* Prolegomena in N. T. p. 58.

† Evangeliarium Quadruplex, vol. i. at p. CDXCII.

‡ Studien und Kritiken for 1847, p. 128.

§ Evangeliarium Quadruplex, vol. ii. after p. 504.

order of Cardinal Quirini, for his edition of the Greek Testament. But it was very imperfectly collated, as Tischendorf has shewn. Out of the seventh chapter Wetstein gives but one various reading, and that is incorrect. Twenty-four should have been produced.* In 1843 Tischendorf transcribed all its various readings into his first edition, and made a careful fac-simile, which have been since published in "*Monumenta Sacra inedita*" (p. 409, et seq.) It has been re-examined by Tregelles, who collated accurately four pages. The uncial character is leaning, and holds an intermediate place between the older and oblong forms. The MS. may be attributed to the eighth century, and is very valuable from the scarcity of uncial MSS. in the Apocalypse.

C. *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus.* This is a rescript MS. in folio size, on parchment, now in the Royal Library at Paris (No. 9). Several works of Ephrem the Syrian were written over a part of the Old Testament and the New. The MS. consists of 209 leaves containing fragments of the Old and New Testaments, 145 of them belonging to the latter, and having considerable portions of all the books except 2 John and 2 Thessalonians. The exact contents are given by Tischendorf, who states, that almost 37 chapters out of 89 are wanting in the four gospels; nearly 10 out of 28 in the Acts; almost 7 of the 21 contained in the Catholic epistles; nearly 35 of the 100 in the Pauline epistles; and almost 8 out of the 22 belonging to the Apocalypse.†

The order of the books is the same as in A. and B. viz. the gospels, Acts, Catholic and Pauline epistles, the epistle to the Hebrews after the second to the Thessalonians, and before the first to Timothy, and the Apocalypse. The text is not divided into columns.

There are four different forms of writing—first the most

* Prolegomena in N. T. p. 74.

† Prolegomena in Cod. Ephraem. Syr. rescript. p. 15.

ancient, secondly the writing of the first corrector, thirdly that of the second corrector, and fourthly that used in the works of Ephrem the Syrian.

The most ancient writing is continuous, having neither accents nor spirits. As to the shape of the letters, it resembles very much what is found in the most ancient MSS., such as A. B. and D. or the Cambridge MS. hereafter to be described. It is most like A. It is peculiar to our MS. that ι and ϒ, when to be pronounced separately, instead of having two dots over them have a very small line. The size of the letters is not everywhere the same. They are usually smaller than those of A. B. and D. or the Clermont, and of about the same size as those in D. or the Cambridge copy.

The only interpunction of the MS. consists in a point, which is usually placed at the middle of a letter, with few exceptions. The space of a letter was generally left between those where the point was put. But the interpunction is not equable in different books. It is most frequent in the Pauline epistles.

Initial letters larger than the rest are found at the beginning of each book and of the small sections, larger than our verses, into which it is divided. They are also at the commencement of the Ammonian sections.

In the gospels the codex has the Ammonian sections, *not* the Eusebian, as Hug erroneously affirms. The larger chapters (τίτλοι) are not indicated at the text itself by a τίτλος (the subject of them) or by any other mark, but in a separate list.

In the Acts as well as the Catholic and Pauline epistles, there is no trace of the Euthalian chapters. Nor is there any trace of chapters in the Apocalypse.

The inscriptions and subscriptions are very simple. Thus Luke's gospel has ευαγγελιον κατα Λουκαν. The epistle to the Romans προς ρωμαιους, &c.

With respect to the country where it was written, all

internal evidence is in favour of Egypt. The character of the text, and the grammatical forms agree with such codices as originated in Egypt or at Alexandria.

The forms and inflexions usually called Alexandrine are numerous, as απολημψεσθε, λημψεται, συνλυπουμενος, αναλημφθεις, ειδαν, ειπαν, ελθατο, &c. In this respect it coincides with the Vatican, Alexandrine, and other ancient MSS.

The age of the codex is supposed by Hug and Tischendorf to be earlier than A. It belongs in all probability to the fifth century.

Tischendorf thinks that the original hand corrected very rarely.*

The first corrector or reviser went over all the books of the New Testament. He wrote very elegantly, without putting accents or spirits, and in such a manner as not to betray a period later than the original age of the codex. He may have belonged to Palestine, or Syria, or Asia Minor. The peculiarity of the text he had was its intermediate position between the Alexandrine and Constantinopolitan. He may have lived a century after the MS. was written.

The second corrector did not revise all the New Testament, but only such parts as were adapted to church use. He was more studious of the *useful* than the *elegant*. His writing is inelegant, unequal, and somewhat negligent. Cognate letters are interchanged and others transposed. His hand was quick and practised, and therefore he used many contractions. Unlike his predecessor, he mostly drew a line over the words he disapproved or wished to be omitted in the public service—sometimes writing above, and sometimes in the margin, what he meant to be substituted. He frequently affixed the accents and spirits, but more in the text than in his notes. The *spirit* he always marks in the same manner, so that he appears to have known only the *asper*. In punctuating the text, he very

* Prolegomena, p. 15.

frequently used a small cross. Hug is too nice in distinguishing the larger and smaller cross, as if the former were put at the close of a period and the latter at a smaller pause, such as the colon. Other signs which he affixed were the usual ones in copies destined for ecclesiastical use, certain musical notes to regulate the intonation of the voice in chanting. The kind of text characteristic of this second corrector is the Constantinopolitan. He is supposed by Tischendorf to have belonged to the ninth century and to Constantinople.*

Tischendorf also discovered a few things in the codex from the hand of a third corrector, or in other words a *fourth* hand. But they are so few as not to be worth noticing.†

In the thirteenth century the old writing was partly washed out with a sponge, and the parchment used for various treatises of Ephrem translated into Greek.

The first knowledge of the ancient writing concealed under the works of Ephrem is due to Peter Allix. After him Boivin very carefully examined the codex, and communicated various interesting particulars of it to Lamy. He also sent extracts from it to Kuster, who used them in his reprint of Mill's Greek Testament. But the person who has the greatest merit in collating it is Wetstein, who spent much time and care upon its pages. Griesbach added something to Wetstein's labours upon it.‡ Scholz *inspected* it, but cannot be said to have done any thing towards supplying or correcting what Wetstein had produced.

In 1834 Fleck induced Hase, keeper of the MSS. in the Bibliotheque du Roi, to allow a chemical infusion to be applied so as to bring out the ancient characters. Accordingly the Giobertine tincture was used in about 100 leaves. By this means the way was prepared for Fleck to make a more accurate examination, which he did particularly in fifteen leaves, and

* Prolegomena, p. 20. † Ibid, p. 7.

‡ Symbolae Criticae, vol. i. p. 3, et seq.

gave an account of his collation in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1841. But it would appear from Tischendorf, that Fleck fell into many egregious blunders.* Finally, the whole text was published by Tischendorf in 1843, to whom scholars owe a debt of gratitude for the manner in which he has put them in possession of the readings of this most valuable MS. Learned Prolegomena of 44 pages are prefixed; and an appendix is subjoined, giving the readings of the second and third hand, with a beautiful fac-simile. The work is entitled, *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus sive fragmenta Novi Testamenti e codice Graeco Parisiensi celeberrimo quinti ut videtur post Christum seculi eruit atque edidit Constantinus Tischendorf, Lipsiae* 1843, 4*to.*

D. *Codex Cantabrigiensis* or *Bezae.* This MS. in large quarto is now in the library of the University at Cambridge. The former history of it is unknown. How it came into Beza's hands is not very clear; neither does he himself speak definitely of the way he got it. It was at Lyons in a monastery dedicated to St. Irenaeus, where Beza found it in 1562; but we do not know whether he purchased it, or if it was given to him. In 1581 Beza presented it to the University of Cambridge. In consequence of the obscurity in which its history is involved, critics have found it difficult to determine whether β of Stephens be this MS. or a copy of it. Marsh has discussed the question very fully, and is inclined to the former opinion.†

The MS. contains the four gospels and Acts of the apostles in Greek and Latin (the old Latin version prior to Jerome), arranged in parallel columns. The uncial letters are upright and square; there are no intervals between the words, no accents or marks of aspiration. In many places a simple dot appears, separating words from one another; in the Latin text

* Prolegomena in Cod. &c. pp. 37, 38.

† In Michaelis's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 691, et seq.

more frequently than in the Greek. We find also: at the beginning of Ammonian sections commonly standing a little out in the margin, but sometimes in the middle of lines. It is *stichometrically* written, and therefore the lines are very unequal. The Greek characters are elegantly formed; but the Latin are not so. The order of the books is the Latin one, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts. It is mutilated in various places, as in Matt. i. 1-20; vi. 20—ix. 2; xxvii. 2-12. John i. 16—iii. 26. Acts viii. 29—x. 14; xxi. 2-10, 16-18; xxii. 10-20; xxii. 29 to the end. In the Latin it wants Matt. i. 1-12; vi. 8—viii. 27; xxvi. 65—xxvii. 2. John i. 1—iii. 16. Acts viii. 19—x. 4; xx. 31—xxi. 7-11; xxii. 2-10; xxii. 20 to the end. Several portions both in the Greek and Latin have been supplied by later hands, some apparently in the ninth century, others in the tenth or after. These are specified by Kipling* and Tischendorf.† The Euthalian summaries of the *stichoi* are not given at the end. The Ammonian sections are marked, without the references to the Eusebian canons. Here and there in the margin appear also liturgical notes, referring to the beginning and end of ecclesiastical lessons. We also meet with titles to paragraphs occasionally in the margin but oftener at the top of the page. None of these things, not even the Ammonian sections are a *prima manu*. They were probably added by more than one person at different times, and shew that though the MS. at first was not designed for ecclesiastical use, it was subsequently adapted to that object.

In the Acts of the apostles the Euthalian sections do not appear. Bishop Marsh says that the text is divided into sections by the first word of each being so written as to have the first letter of it standing in the margin. According to this, the sections are very numerous. But when he farther affirms, that wherever a Euthalian section commences, a new section

* Praefat. in cod. Theodor. Bez. Cantab. p. xxvi.

† Prolegomena in N. T. p. 60.

begins in the codex Bezae,* he is in error, and is consequently mistaken in making these small sections *subdivisions of the Euthalian sections.* We doubt whether they have any connexion with the Euthalian sections. Thus at chap. vi. 8, where a Euthalian section commences, there is no minor section. This is also the case at chap. viii. 1. And at chap. xi. 1, the Euthalian section begins in the middle of a line. Thus the commencement of the Euthalian sections and the smaller ones of the cod. Bezae sometimes agrees and sometimes differs. There are also traces of ecclesiastical lessons, for the initial letters of such lessons have crept into the codex in some places.

There can be no doubt that the Greek and Latin are by the same hand, as Simon long ago shewed. Certain letters clearly prove it. The calligraphist seems to have known Greek very imperfectly as well as Latin. Unskilled in these languages, says Hug, he wrote his MS. in his professional capacity.†

It is generally agreed that the codex was written in Alexandria. It abounds with Alexandrine forms and idioms, even more so than the Vatican MS., as Kipling has pointed out. But the existence of Alexandrine forms and orthography is not conclusive proof of the Egyptian origin of a MS. Rather would the accompaniment of the Latin version point to the west of Europe. According to Hug, it was written after the time of Euthalius and before the Arabian conquest, in the latter part of the fifth, or in the sixth century. The latter is the more probable date.

Various circumstances mentioned by Kipling shew, that if the MS. was not intended for the Latins, it was at least in their possession for a while; for a Latin hand has supplied the Greek text in various places.

It was once thought that the Greek text in all Greek-Latin

* Notes to Michaelis's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 716.

† Einleitung, vol. i. p. 246.

MSS. has been altered from the Latin. But Hug rightly observes, that the very opposite may be satisfactorily established by this MS. The Latin has been accommodated to the Greek, "contrary to all grammatical rules and with childish scrupulosity."*

The text of this MS. is peculiar. Its interpolations are numerous and considerable. It is full of arbitrary glosses and mistakes, especially in the Acts. In this respect no other MS. can be compared with it. Its singularly corrupt text in connexion with its great antiquity is a curious problem which cannot easily be solved. Why should it have numerous glosses and additions to the genuine text, many of which are found in no other ancient document? And yet Bornemann has edited the text of the Acts, and exalts it above the text of all other MSS. His volume is entitled, "*Acta apostolorum a Luca conscripta ad fidem codicis Cantabrigiensis et reliquorum monumentorum denuo recensuit et interpretatus est*, 1848." The preface, consisting of 32 pages, contains a *few* useful things respecting the MS.; but the editor's estimate of it is ridiculously perverse. (See pp. 6, 7.) In the Prolegomena to Tischendorf's second edition of the Greek Testament, the production of Bornemann is severely criticised.

In 1793 Kipling published the text of the codex in facsimile, two volumes folio, Cambridge, with a preface and appendix. But the Prolegomena shew little capacity for criticism or acquaintance with what had been recently written on the subject; and the inconvenience of the "Notae" is apparent. After this, critics were no longer dependent on the collations of it which had been made by Mill and Wetstein.

D. *Cod. Claromontanus.* This parchment codex is now in the Royal Library at Paris (No. 107). It is in quarto size on fine thin vellum, and consists of 533 leaves, having in Greek and Latin, in parallel columns, all the epistles of Paul except a

* Hug, Einleitung, vol. i. p. 248.

few verses, Romans i. 1-7. Romans i. 27-30 both Greek and Latin has been supplied by an ancient hand. After the epistle to the Romans come those to the Corinthians, in the first of which, xiv. 13-22, has been supplied by an ancient hand in the Greek, and xiv. 8-18 is wanting in the Latin. The epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and epistle to the Hebrews follow, the Latin of which last is deficient in xiii. 21-23.

The writing is continuous throughout both in the Greek and Latin texts. Initial letters at the commencement of books as well as of sections are somewhat larger than the rest. As to the ancient character used by the first hand, it approaches to that used in the cod. Vaticanus and cod. Alexandrinus, presenting square and round forms. The letter Π is written so as not to have the cross stroke at the top projecting beyond the sides. Ι and Υ where they are to be pronounced singly have two points over them, as in some other ancient MSS.

The size of the writing is somewhat larger than that in cod. Vaticanus, and very near to that found in the *codd. Ephraemi* and *Cantabrigiensis*. And the whole manner of it is simple, elegant, and ancient.

In regard to accents and spirits, they belong to the ancient correctors of the MS. None of them proceeded from the first hand, except perhaps the apostrophe in some cases, such as ἐπ'αυτους, though apostrophes in most instances must have been added by the corrector.

The Latin character is also uncial, and is very like that found in the *cod. Bezae*, especially in the letters *d* and *b*.

Abbreviations are used, but only such as savour of remote antiquity, ex. gr. Θ̄C Ī C̄ K̄C ΠΗ̄P M̄HP, &c. In Latin D̄S D̄MS ĪHS S̄PS, &c.

There are no marks of interpunction; but the codex is written stichometrically, with twenty-one lines in every page

except two. The Greek and Latin were written at the same time, and by the same hand.

It has been said that the epistle to the Hebrews was added by a later hand. It was certainly *added to* the MS., because the exemplar whence the epistles were copied had not the epistle to the Hebrews; but the hand is either *the same*, which is most probable, or else a contemporary one. It is not later.

The stichometry of the MS. shews that it was written after A. D. 462, when stichometry was first applied by Euthalius to the Pauline epistles. Tischendorf assigns the age of it to the sixth century,* an opinion which may be safely acquiesced in by other critics. According to the same scholar, *the text* is much more ancient than the MS. itself. The Greek text resembles that peculiar conformation which the ancient Latin interpreter had before him. And the Latin text is that ancient one which was circulated very early in northern Africa. The Latin of this codex is a better representative of the most ancient African interpretation in Paul's epistles than is to be found in any other exemplar.

With respect to the country where it was written, Tischendorf thinks that it was Africa. This is favoured by the Alexandrine forms of the text, such as occur in A. B. C. D. and other MSS., ex. gr. λημψεται, προσλημψις, ανεπιλημπτοι, επενψαμεν, πενπει, προπενφθηναι, συνπαθησαι, κ. τ. λ. But such phenomena by no means prove that Africa was its birth-place. The Latin version favours the west of Europe. The scribe was well acquainted with Greek, and therefore very few mistakes are found in this text. But he was ignorant of Latin, and hence he has committed many blunders.

So many correctors have meddled with the text of this codex that it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish what belongs to each. In the first place, the transcriber himself made many changes and corrections. The first corrector is

* Prolegomena in cod. Claromont.

believed by Tischendorf to have been a monk from Sinai or some Greek monastery of the neighbouring parts; and to have lived in the seventh century. The nature of his corrections is described by the same scholar. He may be marked D^{**}, and his revision comprehended the entire Greek text. He was followed by D^{**b} who corrected only a few places both in the Greek and Latin. D^{**c} changed a very few places. But the fourth corrector D^{***} went through the whole MS., put accents and spirits into it, altered the orthography, and endeavoured to introduce in a measure another recension into the text. He corrected the text in upwards of two thousand places, using that oblong uncial character which was employed after the seventh century. Tischendorf thinks that he belonged to the ninth century, and gives many examples of his corrections, in the Prolegomena to his edition of the codex. Besides the persons just referred to, the same critic distinguishes D^{c}, D^{***b}, D^{**}_{**}, d^{**e}, d^{***}, D^{nov}.

The name of this MS., *Claromontanus*, which it first received from Beza, has given rise to many conjectures. He says that it was found in the Clermont monastery, whence it came into his hands. Afterwards it was brought to Paris, and belonged to Claudius Puteanus. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, thirty-five leaves were cut out of it and stolen by John Aymon. But these were afterwards sent back, one from Holland by Stosel who had purchased it, and thirty-four by the Earl of Oxford.

The codex was first used by Beza. It was afterwards examined by John Morin. Readings of it were given by Walton in his Polyglott, and by Curcellaeus. It was first collated with great labour and diligence by Wetstein in 1715 and 1716. Griesbach examined it in several places, and corrected a few of Wetstein's readings.* The whole has been published, with a fac-simile specimen, by Tischendorf, in a splendidly

* Symbolae Criticae, vol. ii. p. 31, et seq.

printed large quarto volume, with copious prolegomena, and a most useful appendix, giving the various corrections. The Latin text had been published before by Sabatier, but very incorrectly, as would appear from Tischendorf's remarks. The title of Tischendorf's work is "*Codex Claromontanus sive Epistulae Pauli omnes Graece et Latine ex codice Parisiensi celeberrimo nomine Claromontani plerumque dicto, sexti ut videtur post Christum seculi nunc primum edidit Constantinus Tischendorf, Lipsiae*, 1852."

E. *Cod. Basileensis* K. iv. 35, formerly B. vi. 21, a MS. of the four gospels in the public library at Basel. The codex is deficient in some parts—in Luke iii. 4-15, xxiv. 47 to the end of the gospels. Luke i. 69—ii. 4; xii. 58—xiii. 12; xv. 8-20, have been affixed by a later hand and in small letters.

The text is written in large, beautiful, uncial characters, certain letters ϹЄΟΘ being wholly round. It has also a very simple system of interpunction, a dot being placed to denote different pauses. There are accents and marks of aspiration. The text is divided into small sections as in A. and C. the initial letter of each standing out in the margin.

But several things have been added to the original MS. There are compressed and lengthened letters not merely at the end of a line where there was little room, but in the summaries of the chapters or τίτλοι prefixed to the gospels, in the designations of the Ammonian sections, in the references to other evangelists in the lower margin, in the designations of the festivals, and in certain formulae at the beginning of church lessons marked on the upper margin. These additions point to the ninth century; and therefore the MS. itself should be placed in the eighth.

There is evidence in the codex that it was for a long time in Constantinople or the neighbourhood. Hug produces two proofs which are quite sufficient.* It was used as a *church-*

* Einleit. vol. i. pp. 261, 262.

MS. in Constantinople; and therefore the designations of church lessons are by the first hand. As to the τίτλοι, the Ammonian sections, the notation of sacred festivals, they were put by a later hand.

Wetstein thinks that the words were *dictated to* the copyist, who was by no means skilled in what he wrote, and therefore he frequently confounded ε and αι; ει, ι, and η; ω and ο; οι and υ. Hence he has κλαθμος for κλαυθμος. The nature of the text is what is called Byzantine or Constantinopolitan. Hence it agrees very often with F. G. H. It will be understood that it is *a very early specimen* of the Byzantine class; and its value is considerable, as Mill rightly judged.

The codex was presented by Cardinal Johannes de Ragusio in the fifteenth century to a monastery in Basel, whence it was transferred to the public library of the same city in 1559. Mill thought that Erasmus used it in preparing his Greek Testament; but Wetstein proved the contrary. The mistake arose from the fact that Erasmus used another Basel MS. with which this one has many readings in common. It has often been collated, especially by Wetstein and Tischendorf, by the latter in 1843, and by Tregelles in 1846.

E. *Cod. Laudianus* 3. This is a Greek-Latin manuscript of the Acts of the apostles. The Latin version, which is the *Ante-Hieronymian*, precedes the Greek text on each page, occupying as it does the left-hand column, while the Greek occupies the right. This arrangement is unusual. The characters are uncial, square, large, heavy, and rough. Both columns are placed stichometrically, only one word being commonly written in a line, seldom two or three; and each Latin word is always opposite to the Greek word. Hence it has been supposed that the MS. was made for the use of a person who was not skilled in both languages; and as the Latin occupies the first column that *it* was the known lan-

guage, the other not being well known; a fact pointing to the west of Europe.

The Euthalian chapters are marked by larger initial letters running out into the margin. The accents and enumeration of *stichoi* at the end are wanting.

There is a chasm from xxvi. 29 to xxviii. 26.

Internal evidence shews the Alexandrine origin of *the text.* It has Alexandrine forms and an Alexandrine orthography. Thus we meet with ειπα, ειπας, ειπαν, ανειλατε, εξειλατο, ενειλατο, ηυραν, εξηλλατο, διεμαρτυρατο, ελημψεν. Hence the opinion of Woide that it was made in the east is plausible.* But the accompanying Latin version, and especially the place it occupies, points to the west of Europe in preference to Egypt. We agree with those who place it in the sixth century rather than the seventh, though it should be put towards the end of the former.

The text is very valuable, not only in itself, but because it effectually disposes of the charge of Latinising once brought against Greek-Latin MSS. generally.

At the end of the codex, on the last leaf, is the edict of a Sardinian prince Flavius Pancratius, which Hug thinks must certainly contain some date or designation of time.† But he is mistaken, for Wetstein gave the whole, and there is no date. The same critic shews that Justinian first appointed *Duces Sardiniae* in 534 A.D., who ceased entirely after 749 A.D. Thus the codex seems to have been in Sardinia in the seventh or eighth century. Some have thought that it was *written* there in the seventh century. But it rather appears to have been brought from another country.

It was observed by Mill that it agrees wonderfully (mirifice) with that codex of the Acts after which the venerable Bede wrote his *Retractationes* on the Acts of the apostles. But he thought our MS. was written after the time of Bede.

* Notitia cod. Alexand. ed. Spohn, p. 151. † Einleit. vol. i. p. 249.

Wetstein endeavoured to shew that it was the very codex which Bede employed;* an opinion which Woide confirmed by an additional array of passages amounting to 32.† In opposition to this opinion however, Michaelis quotes Bede's own words, in which he represents the Greek readings as being different from the Latin in some places, and expresses an uncertain conjecture that similar translations might afterwards be found in the Latin, without naming the Latin of the codex itself.‡ Yet the weight of evidence is in favour of the identity.

The MS. was printed both in Greek and Latin by Hearne at Oxford, where the MS. itself is deposited, having been presented by Archbishop Laud in 1715, 8vo. Critics complain of the great rarity of this impression. Sabatier printed the Latin alone.

E. *Cod. Sangermanensis* of the Pauline epistles. This is a Greek-Latin codex of Paul's epistles, with accents and marks of aspiration accompanying the uncial Greek letters. It is defective in Romans viii. 21-33, xi. 15-25; 1 Timothy i. 1—vi. 15; Heb. xii. 8 to the end.

It has been correctly supposed that this MS. is a copy of the *cod. Claromontanus*. And the copy is by no means accurate. It has many blunders and ridiculous readings arising from jumbling together the corrections in D. which proceeded from several hands. This has been amply shewn by Wetstein,§ and Griesbach.‖ Semler¶ however assented to it only in part; and Marsh,** following him, termed it a sort of *codex eclecticus*, in making which the Clermont MS. was *principally* but not at all times consulted. But internal evidence shews that the writer scarcely has a claim to the character of a man

* Nov. Testament, vol. ii. p. 450. † Notitia cod. Alexandr. p. 156, et seq.
‡ Introduction to the New Test. vol. ii. p. 273.
§ Prolegomena in N. T. vol. ii. pp. 7, 8.
‖ Symbolae criticae, vol. ii. p. 77, et seq.
¶ Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, vol. iv. pp. 63-65.
** Notes to Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 785.

who purposed to make a *cod. eclecticus*. He was grossly ignorant. Thus the MS. has in Romans iv. 25, δικαιωσινην; in 2 Cor. i. 5, το παθηματα; in Heb. x. 33, νιδιζομενοθεατριζομενοι. The copyist sometimes followed the first reading of D., sometimes the third, sometimes two were jumbled together, sometimes he blundered himself. The Latin as well as the Greek has been copied from the Clermont codex; but it has been altered after another text agreeing for the most part with the Hieronymian.* Montfaucon† and Blanchini‡ have both given fac-similes.

The age of the MS. cannot be determined. Probably it should not be placed higher than the tenth century. Mill first procured extracts from it; but Wetstein's collation is thought by Tischendorf to be the best. Muralt has recently endeavoured to vindicate a higher place for the codex, and has given extracts from it.§ Tischendorf however affirms that his extracts abound with mistakes.‖

The name *Sangermanensis* is derived from the monastery of St. Germain des Prez in Paris, where it formerly was. At the beginning of the present century it was purchased by a Russian nobleman and taken to Petersburgh, where it was seen by Matthaei in 1805, and has ever since lain. Hence the story about its being stolen from Paris by some Russian soldier during the visit of the Muscovites to Paris, on Napoleon's downfall, is ridiculously false.

F. *Codex Boreeli.* This codex contains the four gospels, but many leaves of it have perished. In the time of Wetstein it began with Matt. vii. 6—viii. 34, and ended with John xiii. 34. It has many chasms now, several of which did not exist

* See Tischendorf's cod. Claromontanus, Prolegomena, pp. 25, 26.

† Palaeogr. Graeca, p. 218.

‡ Evangeliarium Quadruplex, vol. i. plates to p. 533.

§ In his Catalogus Codicum Bibliothecae Imperialis publicae Graecorum et Latinorum. Fasciculus primus, p. 3, et seq.

‖ Prolegomena in N. T. p. 72.

in Wetstein's day. Thus in Luke alone there are 24 chasms of verses here and there. Two hundred and four leaves, with thirteen fragments of others, are all that now remain of the codex. It was formerly in the possession of John Boreel, Dutch ambassador at London in the time of James the First, whence its name; and is now in the public library at Utrecht. Wetstein procured various readings of it for his edition, extending only however from the commencement *at that time* (Matt. vii. 6) to Luke xi. Professor Heringa wrote a *disputation* upon it which was published by Vinke in 1843, and supplies the place of an edition. Both Tischendorf and Tregelles compared it with the MS. collation of Heringa since 1840. The text appears to be what Griesbach terms Constantinopolitan; and the MS. belongs to the ninth century.

F^{a}. *Cod. Coislinianus.* This letter F. was applied by Wetstein to a fragment of the New Testament written in the scholia of *Cod. Coislinianus* 1, a MS. of the Old Testament. Because that critic found Acts ix. 24, 25 written by the same hand which wrote the MS. itself, he noted the passage by F. F^{a}. therefore does not designate a MS. of the New Testament. In 1842 Tischendorf examining the codex again, and especially the scholia, found twenty passages of the gospels, Acts, and epistles, viz. Matt. v. 48; xii. 48; xxvii. 25. Luke i. 42; ii. 24; xxiii. 21. John v. 35; vi. 53, 55. Acts iv. 33, 34; x. 13, 15; xxii. 22. 1 Corinth. vii. 39; xi. 29. 2 Corinth. iii. 13; ix. 7; xi. 33. Gal. iv. 21, 22. Col. ii. 16, 17. Heb. x. 26. These fragments have been published and illustrated by the same indefatigable critic, in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, p. 403. They were written in the seventh century. The MS., so called from Coislin bishop of Metz, now in the Benedictine Library of St. Germain des Prez, is written in the uncial characters, with accents and marks of aspiration, which are omitted in some places.*

* See Prolegomena to Tischendorf's Monumenta inedita, p. 24, et seq.

F. *Cod. Augiensis*, a Greek-Latin MS. of Paul's epistles, written in uncial letters and without accents. The letters are not written continuously, for there are both intervals between the words and a dot at the end of each. The words χριστος and ιησους are not abbreviated as in the common MSS. $\overline{\text{XC}}$ and $\overline{\text{IC}}$; but $\overline{\text{XPC}}$ and $\overline{\text{IHC}}$, as in D. or the Cambridge MS. The Latin and Greek occupy columns on the same page, first the Latin, then the Greek. The Latin version can scarcely be called either the old Latin or the Hieronymian, since it is patched and mended so as to be a mixture of both texts. It is written in the Anglo-Saxon cursive hand. The epistle to the Hebrews is wanting in the Greek, but not in the Latin. The codex begins with Romans iii. 19, and has various chasms.

The age of this MS. is determined by a Latin appendix to the epistle to the Hebrews written *prima manu* and taken from Rhaban Maurus. Hence it cannot be dated earlier than the last half of the ninth century. The codex in question was hastily collated by Wetstein. Its various readings were also transferred by Bentley into an Oxford copy, in 1675. In 1842 it was accurately collated by Tischendorf. It was also collated by Tregelles.

The appellation *Augiensis* is taken from the monastery of Augia Major at Rheinau in Switzerland, where the MS. once was. After passing through several hands it was purchased by Bentley in 1718, and is now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, all his MSS. having been deposited there in 1787 after the death of the younger Bentley.

There can be little doubt that it was written in the west of Europe, or by some western Christian, because the Latin precedes the Greek column, and the *Anglo-Saxon* formation of the Latin letters is used. It is not improbable that it was made in Switzerland by a native of Ireland or Scotland, from which countries numerous emigrants repaired to Germany, and founded there monastic institutions and abbeys. Most of these

foreigners were educated men, and had some knowledge of the Greek language.

An affinity between this codex and G. *(Boernerianus)* has always attracted notice. In the great majority of their readings they coincide. But in a few of each epistle they differ. In G. there is a vacant space after Romans xiv. 23, which is not in F. In G. at the end of the epistle to Philemon are written the words προς λαουδακησας αρχεται επιστολη, which are not in F. In G. the Latin version is interlinear; in F. in parallel columns. In G. the Latin version of the epistle to the Hebrews is wanting as well as the Greek original; in F. it is present. But notwithstanding these differences, the coincidences in readings, and in mistakes too, are very great. The chasms in the Greek of both are also the same. To explain their affinity, it has been supposed that F. was copied from G. or *vice versa*. More probable is it that both were transcribed from one and the same exemplar which had received different corrections. The same age and country must be assigned to both.

G. *Cod. Seidelii.* This is a MS. of the four gospels with various chasms. Matthew's gospel begins with vi. 6, and there are wanting vii. 25—viii. 9; viii. 23—ix. 2; xxviii. 18—Mark i. 13; xiv. 19-25. Luke i. 1-13; v. 4—vii. 3; viii. 46—ix. 5; xii. 27-51; xxiv. 41—to the end. John xviii. 5-19; xix. 4-27. Some of these parts are supplied in the cursive character by later hands. The MS. is in 4to, written in uncial letters, but of the oblong kind usual in the tenth century. The subscriptions at the end of the gospels are in the small character. It has accents and marks of aspiration *a prima manu*. According to Griesbach it is hardly older than the twelfth century.* Wolf placed it in the eighth; Scholz in the eleventh. Wolf collated it and published the extracts in the third volume of his Anecdota Graeca, p. 48, et seq. After

* Symbolae Criticae, vol. i. p. 65.

him Griesbach supplied a few readings. It was subsequently collated by Tischendorf in 1842, and by Tregelles. The text is of the Constantinopolitan type.

Andrew Erasmus Seidel brought it from the east, from whom it is commonly called *Seidelii*. It was afterwards purchased by La Croze and presented to Wolf, who is said to have sent it to Bentley. At present it is in the British Museum, among the *codd. Harleianos*, numbered 5684.

G. in the Acts and Catholic epistles, J. in the Pauline. This is a MS. in the Angelican Library at Rome, where it is marked A. 2. 15, formerly Cardinal Passionei's. It is imperfect in the Acts till viii. 10, and in Paul's epistles from Heb. xiii. 10 to the end. Blanchini and Birch examined it in a few places. Scholz collated the entire in 1820, and Fleck in 1833. It was most accurately collated by Tischendorf in 1843, and also by Tregelles, who noticed many errors in Scholz's extracts. Blanchini attributes it to the seventh or eighth century; Tischendorf to the ninth. The former gave a fac-simile specimen of it.*

G. in the Pauline epistles, *cod. Boernerianus*. This is a Greek-Latin MS. containing thirteen epistles of Paul, that to the Hebrews being absent both in the Greek and Latin. The Latin version can scarcely be called the old Latin or the Hieronymian, for it is a patchwork of both with many blunders. It is interlined between the Greek, being written over the words of which it is the translation. Besides the chasms which it has in common with F., viz. 1 Cor. iii. 8-16; vi. 7-14. Colos. ii. 1-8. Philemon 21 to the end; it wants Romans i. 1-5; ii. 16-25. Its similarities and differences in relation to F. have been already noticed. There is little doubt from the uniformity of the writing and colour of the ink that the Latin and Greek proceeded from the same hand. The Greek characters are uncial, but of a peculiar form. The Latin is written

* Evangeliarium Quadruplex, vol. i. at DLIX.

in cursive Anglo-Saxon. According to Hug, the text is from a stichometrical copy, though it is continuous, the *stichoi* not being separated. Instead of this, the transcriber marked the beginning of each of them by an initial letter. The copyist also added marks of punctuation; but he omitted the accents. The copy from which the codex was taken appears to have been written in Alexandria. This is shewn by the idioms that occur, προσωπολημψια, δοσεως και λημψεως, μεταλημψις, προλημψις, αντιλημψις, &c. ειλατο, γεγοναν, επεπεσαν, εξελθατε. Like cod. F. the MS. itself seems to have been written in the west, or by a native of the west. It has been referred to France or Germany; but it may belong as well to Switzerland. Kuster refers it to Britain; Doederlein to Ireland. More likely is it to have been made by a native of Ireland or Scotland who had emigrated to the continent of Europe, and was connected with some monastery there. On the margin there is frequently noted by the first hand *contra* γοδδιδασκαλκον, *contra Graecos*. Gottschalk disputed about predestination in the ninth century; and in the same century the Greeks and Latins separated. Hence the MS. appears to belong to the ninth century.

Kuster complains of the unskilfulness and ignorance of the scribe, and with reason, though some of the proofs he adduces are totally erroneous.* The copyist had certainly little acquaintance with Greek. He also unwarrantably corrected the Greek according to the Latin in some places. Notes are found in the margin which are Irish.

There is a transcript of this MS. in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, among the MSS. left by Bentley. It must have been intended for his edition of the Greek Testament. The text was first published by Matthaei at Meissen, 1791 4to, with a fac-simile specimen. The codex formerly belonged

* Praefatio to Reprint of Mill's Greek Test.

to Professor Boerner of Leipzig, and therefore its name *Boernerianus*. It is now in the Royal Library at Dresden.

H. *Seidelii* of the four gospels, in quarto, in uncial letters. This MS., as well as G., was brought from the east by Seidel. The text is mutilated in many places. It begins with Matt. xv. 30, and was collated by Wolf, who published the extracts in the third volume of his *Anecdota Graeca*. It has also been collated by Tregelles for his edition of the Greek Testament, who says that Wolf's is "both very defective and very incorrect." * Like G., it was purchased by La Croze and given to Wolf, whence it got into the public library at Hamburgh. Scholz places it in the eleventh century. When he says that the text agrees with the Constantinopolitan recension, though it has many readings which are common to the Alexandrine, no idea of the real form of the text is conveyed. Among Bentley's papers in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, fragments of these two MSS., G. and H., have been found by Tregelles, which Wolf himself cut out and sent to Bentley. He mutilated his own MSS.!

H. *Cod. Mutinensis* of the Acts of the apostles. This MS. is in folio in uncial letters. It is defective at the beginning from i. 1—v. 27. It also wants ix. 39—x. 19; xiii. 36—xiv. 3. From κακειθεν in xxvii. 4 to the end of the Acts is supplied in uncial letters by a hand of the eleventh century. The other parts are also supplied, but by a recent hand of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. The MS. contains the Catholic and Pauline epistles too, but in the cursive character (marked 179). According to Scholz and Tischendorf it was written in the ninth century. It is deposited in the public library of Modena, and was first collated by Scholz; afterwards, far more accurately by Tregelles and Tischendorf.

H. of the Pauline epistles *Coislinianus*. This MS. is in

* Journal of Sacred Literature for October 1850, p. 451.

4to, written in large, square uncial characters of ancient form. It is furnished with accents and marks of aspiration, and had the Euthalian subscriptions. The words are stichometrically divided. All that remains of the MS. is fourteen leaves, which are separated now, twelve of them being in the Royal Library at Paris, and two in the Imperial Library at Petersburgh. Of course they contain nothing more than some passages in the Pauline epistles. Montfaucon first printed these fragments with a fac-simile;* and Griesbach collated them anew. Tischendorf made a most accurate copy of the whole. At one time the codex was on Mount Athos, where in the thirteenth century (1218) the leaves were attached by way of cover to another MS. From Mount Athos they were transferred to France, and were in Montfaucon's time in the library of Bishop Coislin at Metz. Hence the name Coislinianus (No. 202). The MS. probably belongs to the sixth century. According to Montfaucon it was written in Syria or Palestine, since a note at the end states that it was compared in the library at Caesarea with the codex of Pamphilus, written by his own hand. But this postscript belongs to Euthalius, and not to the copyist.

J. *Cod. Cottonianus* of the gospels. This fragment consists of four leaves of purple parchment, with silver characters. The following passages are contained in the leaves:—Matt. xxvi. 57-65; xxvii. 26-34; John xiv. 2-10; xv. 15-22. All were published for the first time by Tischendorf in his "Monumenta Sacra inedita," and are assigned by him to the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century. As the name *Cottonianus* implies, the leaves are now in the British Museum marked (Tit. C.XV). Six leaves originally belonging to the same MS, are now in the Vatican Library, viz. Γ of the gospels. There are two other leaves in the Caesarean Library at

* Bibliotheca Coisliniana, p. 251.

Vienna, viz. N of the gospels. It were desirable that the three parts should be brought and kept together.

J. of the Catholic epistles, K. of the Pauline epistles *g* of Matthaei. This MS. containing the Catholic epistles entire, with a catena of the fathers, and also the Pauline with these chasms, Romans x. 18—1 Corinth. vi. 13. 1 Corinth. viii. 7—11 is in the library at Moscow of the Holy Synod belonging to the Russian Church (No. XCVIII), having been brought from the monastery of St. Dionysius on Mount Athos. It was collated by Matthaei, and belongs to the ninth century.

J. of the Pauline epistles is the same as G. of the Acts and Catholic epistles.

K. *Cod. Cyprius* of the four gospels. This MS. in 4to is written in uncial letters of a later form, narrow and compressed. The punctuation marks are inserted without regard to grammatical division; and a dot is used to denote the end of a *stichos*, to save space. The accents are negligently placed and often wanting. Hug assigns to this MS. the first place in clearly informing us how the change from stichometry to proper punctuation occurred. Stichometry was laid aside before it was written. It contains the Eusebian canons, and a synaxarium, and was evidently intended for ecclesiastical use; for words referring to lessons frequently occur in the margin *a prima manu.*

The text was collated and described by Scholz,* who also gave a fac-simile of its characters. Montfaucon had formerly given a fac-simile, and assigned the codex to the eighth century.† But it belongs to the middle or end of the ninth. Tischendorf collated it anew, with far greater care than Scholz. So also Tregelles. The name *Cyprius* is given to it because it was brought from the island of Cyprus in 1673 into the

* Curae Criticae in historiam textus evangell.

† Palaeographia Graeca, p. 231.

Colbert Library. It is now in the Royal Library at Paris (No. 63.)

K. of the Pauline epistles is the same with J. of the Catholic epistles.

L. *Cod. Reg. Paris.* (62). This MS. of the gospels is written in uncial letters not of the ancient form but oblong. Each page is divided into two columns, and the words usually follow without intervals. The punctuation is indicated by two marks, a cross, and a comma. The accents are frequently wanting, and often wrongly placed even when inserted. The usual abbreviations occur; and the letters AY and OY are sometimes written with contractions. Sometimes a letter is omitted in the middle of a word. The τίτλοι, the Ammonian sections with references to the Eusebian canons are given, together with other minor divisions written in red letters and in various forms standing out in the margin. It has only five chasms, viz. Matt. iv. 22—v. 14; xxviii. 17 to the end. Mark x. 16-30; xv. 2-20; John xxi. 15 to the end. The orthography is what is called Alexandrine. Alexandrine forms abound, ex. gr. λημψομαι, ειπαν, ηλθαν, ισαν, ιδαν, εξηλθατε, ευρα, ευραμεν, εωρακαν. It appears to have been made in Egypt. Griesbach and Hug assign it to the ninth century; Tischendorf to the eighth.

Every page abounds with orthographical mistakes. Vowels and dipthongs are frequently confounded, of which Griesbach has furnished many examples.* The copyist appears to have been an ignorant man as well as negligent. He has made many mistakes; and, according to Griesbach had various copies before him from which he took readings into his text. The initial letters of the public lessons are written in red ink, and in the margin we frequently meet with ἀρχη and τελος shewing that the codex was intended for ecclesiastical use. The MS. is in the Royal Library at Paris.

Griesbach set a high value on the text of this MS. It

* Symbolae Criticae, vol. i. p. 67, et seq.

agrees remarkably with the readings of Origen, as may be seen by Griesbach's laborious comparison.* Above all, it has a great affinity to B. or the Vatican MS. It also coincides with C. or the cod. Ephrem, and is an excellent representative of the text current at Alexandria. The charges made against it by Wetstein have been disproved by Less, Michaelis, and Griesbach, who take a juster view of the codex.

Stephens was the first who collated it, but he did not print all his extracts. Beza printed forty readings from the papers of Stephens. It is thought that η of Stephens is the same MS., an opinion which Marsh has rendered all but certain.† Wetstein collated it hastily. Griesbach afterwards re-collated and described it with great care, with the exception of Matt. viii. to xviii. 10, which chapters he merely examined in a cursory manner. Since Griesbach and Scholz's collations, the whole has been extracted and published by Tischendorf with great industry and very accurate fac-similes in his "Monumenta Sacra inedita." According to this critic, Hug's table representing the character presents a most inadequate likeness.

L. Adopting the suggestion of Tischendorf, we apply this letter in the Pauline epistles to an ancient fragment written in the uncial character, cited in the commentaries of Matthaei. It merely contains Hebrews x. 1-7 ; x. 32-38, a few intermediate words being lost. This fragment was applied in A.D. 975 to bind together a codex of Gregory Nazianzen.

M. *Cod. Regius de Camps* (No. 48) of the four gospels entire. This quarto sized MS. is written in uncial characters, with accents and marks of punctuation. It has the Eusebian canons, synaxaria, summaries of chapters, and marks above the lines in red ink, apparently notes to regulate the chanting. There are various readings in the margin in cursive character *a prima manu*. The MS. was presented to Louis XIV. by

* Symb. Crit. vol. i. p. 80, et seq.

† Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, &c. Leipzig 1795, 8vo.

the Abbé de Camps in 1706, and is now in the Royal Library at Paris. It may be referred to the end of the ninth century or beginning of the tenth. The text agrees generally with the Alexandrine one; and it has a few readings peculiar to K. or the *Cyprius*. Scholz collated it throughout. Tischendorf and Tregelles also collated it; the former of whom contradicts the assertion of Hug that the characters are *laboured* as if they were imitated. On the contrary, they possess some elegance. Montfaucon has given a fac-simile specimen,* and also Blanchini.†

N. *Cod. Caesareus Vindobonensis*. This fragment of the gospels consists of two leaves of purple parchment with silver letters, containing Luke xxiv. 13-21, 39-49. They belong to the same MS. as J and Γ of the gospels. As the name imports, the fragment is now in the Imperial Library at Vienna. The text was *accurately* printed for the first time by Tischendorf in his "Monumenta Sacra inedita." He refers the date to the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century.

O. *Cod. Mosquensis* of the gospels. This is nothing but a fragment of some larger MS. consisting of eight leaves, which contain John i. 1-4; xx. 10-13, 15-17, 20-24. Some scholia are written beside these portions in cursive characters. The fragment is now in the Holy Synod's Library at Moscow, having been brought from Mount Athos. The leaves were glued by way of fastening to a MS. of Chrysostom's homilies. Tischendorf dates them in the ninth century; and Matthaei collated them at Moscow.

In the editions of Wetstein, Griesbach, and Scholz, it will be observed, that O. designates a fragment of Luke's gospel presented to Montfaucon by Anselm Banduri. This fragment contains Luke xviii. 11-13, with verse 14 from τον οικον. But Tischendorf shews that it belonged to an evangelistarium or

* Palaeographia Graeca, pp. 260, 261.

† Evangeliarium Quadruplex, vol. i. p. CDXCII.

lesson-book of the gospels of the tenth century. Hence it should be expunged from the present list, and another O substituted, as we have done after Tischendorf's example.*

P. *Cod. Guelpherbytanus A.* This is a rescript MS. Fragments of the four gospels written, as is supposed, in the sixth century, were erased in the eighth or ninth century for the purpose of writing various works of Isidore of Spain. These fragments, containing portions of the four gospels, were published with a commentary by Knittel at Brunswick 1762, 4to. But though this scholar took great pains to decypher the fragments, and printed accurately all that he could read, there is a probability that more might be made out by closer inspection or the application of chemical substances. The parts that have been deciphered are enumerated by Tischendorf. As the name indicates, the MS. is in the library at Wolfenbüttel.

Q. *Cod. Guelpherbytanus B.* This is another rescript MS. in the same library at Wolfenbüttel. Fragments of the gospels of Luke and John were erased to make room for treatises of Isidore of Spain. The fragments were deciphered and published by Knittel. Tischendorf enumerates the passages. They are attributed like P. to the sixth century.

R. *Cod. Neapolitanus.* This is a *Typicum* or monastic ritual of the Greek church marked *Borbonicus* II. C. 15 in the library at Naples. Fragments of the gospels have been discovered under the recent writing, amounting to twelve or fourteen leaves. Tischendorf attributes them to the eighth century. By applying a chemical test Tischendorf was able to read one page, Mark xiv. 32-39, which he published in the Wiener Jahrbücher for 1847. R. in the editions of Griesbach and Scholz is applied to a Tübingen fragment having John i. 38-50. But Tischendorf shews that the fragment belongs to an *Evangelistarium* of about the eleventh century. Hence

* Prolegomena in N. T. p. 63.

it should be discarded from the present list. Our R. follows Tischendorf's annotation.*

S. *Cod. Vaticanus* 354. This MS. contains the four gospels complete. It is on vellum in folio, written in compressed uncial characters, and was made by one Michael a monk in 949, according to the subscription. The text contains what is called the Constantinopolitan recension. Birch was the first who collated it at Rome, and gave extracts from it in his edition of the four gospels. Tischendorf afterwards inspected it cursorily, but gave a good fac-simile of it, stating the faults of those representations which had been given by Blanchini and Birch.

T. *Cod. Borgianus* 1. This MS. in quarto contains fragments of John's gospel having the Thebaic or Sahidic version at the side of them. They consist of vi. 28-67; vii. 6-52; viii. 12-31. The date is the fifth century, not the fourth as Georgi endeavoured to prove. They were published by Georgi at Rome in 1789, with the Sahidic version; and are in the library of the Propaganda College at Rome. Tischendorf states that he examined the codex and made a fac-simile.

U. *Cod. Nanianus* 1, now *Venetus Marcianus*. This MS. contains the four gospels entire, with the Eusebian canons. It was first collated by Münter, whose extracts were inserted by Birch in his Greek Testament. It belongs to the ninth or tenth century. In 1843 it was collated again by Tischendorf, and recollated by Tregelles. There is reason to believe that Tischendorf's extracts are not very accurate. The MS. is in the library of St. Mark's at Venice; and though the text is generally of the later type, yet it accords with the Alexandrine in many remarkable readings.

V. *Cod. Mosquensis* of the four gospels. This codex is written on vellum in octavo in uncial letters, probably of the ninth century. But from *ουπω γαρ ην* in John vii. 39 is cursive writing

* Prolegomena in N. T. p. 64.

of the thirteenth century. It was defective (in 1779) in Matt. v. 44—vi. 12 and ix. 18—x. 1. In 1783 it had also lost Matt. xxii. 44—xxiii. 35. John xxi. 10 to the end. It was first described, and extracts given from it by Matthaei in his Greek Testament, with a fac-simile. He collated it twice. It is deposited in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow.*

W. *Cod. Reg. Paris* 314. This consists of two fragments (two leaves) containing Luke ix. 34-47 and x. 12-22. It is written on vellum, in quarto, and belongs to the eighth century. Scholz was the first who made a collation of the passages; but it is a very imperfect one. The whole has been published by Tischendorf with a fac-simile in his "Monumenta Sacra inedita." As the name imports, the codex is in the Royal Library at Paris.

X. *Cod. Monacensis*, formerly called *Ingolstadiensis* and *Landishutensis*. This MS. contains fragments of the four gospels. The passages it exhibits are accurately given by Tischendorf, not by Scholz. From Matt. ii. 22—vii. 1 have been supplied by a hand of the twelfth century; so that the MS. is really defective until vii. 1. To the text of the gospels of Matthew and John are added commentaries taken from Chrysostom; on John xix. 6, &c., from Origen and Hesychius of Jerusalem; and on Luke, from Titus of Bostra. These commentaries are written in a small character among the Greek lines, resembling the character in an Oxford codex of Plato's Dialogues written in 896. Hence the date may be the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century. Dobrovski communicated some readings of this codex to Griesbach. It was collated for the first time by Scholz. After him, it has been collated again by Tischendorf and Tregelles. It is now in the public library at Munich, and commonly exhibits an ancient and good text—what has been called the Alexandrine.

* Matthaei's Greek Testament, vol. x. p. 265.

Y. *Cod. Bibliothecae Barberinae* 225. This is a fragment (six leaves) of John's gospel, written on vellum, in folio, probably of the eighth century. It contains John xvi. 3—xix. 41, prefixed to a codex of the gospels furnished with Theophylact's commentaries, of the twelfth century. Scholz imperfectly collated the fragment; and Tischendorf has published it entire, with a fac-simile in his "Monumenta Sacra inedita." The name implies that it is in the Barberinian Library at Rome.

Z. *Cod. Dublinensis*, a rescript MS. of Matthew's gospel. Dr. Barrett of Trinity College, Dublin, writing in 1801 says, that fourteen years ago he met with a Greek MS. in the library of the University, on some leaves of which he observed traces of a twofold writing, one ancient, the other comparatively recent. The old letters had been much effaced either by art or time. On minutely examining the ancient writing over which the other had been written, he found it to consist of three fragments of Isaiah, St. Matthew, and certain orations of Gregory Nazianzen. He applied himself to the transcription of what remained of Matthew's gospel; the whole was accurately engraved in fac-simile on sixty-four copper plates; and the work was published at the expense of the University in a very splendid form, in quarto. The editor gives on the opposite page to the fac-simile the words in the usual Greek type, with lines corresponding. Here his accuracy cannot be commended. In fact he has made many blunders. Below each page is a collation of the readings of A. B. C. D. L. and various other MSS.; several of the fathers, especially Origen, the two Syriac versions and others, including the old Latin. Extracts from all these sources are given; and the variations from the Amsterdam text (1711) of Gerard Maestricht carefully marked. The MS. is *not* collated with the text of Wetstein, as has been erroneously affirmed.

The prolegomena give an account of the MS., followed by

an essay on the genealogy of our Lord. An appendix contains a collation of the *codex Montfortianus*.

Hug says correctly that the MS. is inferior to none in point of beauty. The character is of the ancient form, large, round, and full. The shape of A. and M. is somewhat peculiar; while Υ Χ Δ have curves at the top. Sometimes Ι and Υ have two dots over them, as is the case in various ancient MSS. There are no accents or spirits. In regard to punctuation, the only mark is a dot. When this stands in a considerable blank space it denotes a period; in a space equal to about half a letter it is equivalent to the colon; in a space scarcely so large as that intended for the colon it denotes a comma. Each page contains one column, and the columns usually consist of twenty-one lines; sometimes but rarely of twenty-three. The lines are nearly of equal lengths, and ordinarily contain eighteen or twenty letters.

The codex has the τίτλοι or larger chapters marked both at the top of the page and in the margin. At present, however, this appears only once in the margin, viz. at xviii. 1; and four times at the top of the page. It has also the Ammonian sections, which are *actually* found here only in xiv. 13 and xviii. 1; but not the Eusebian canons. In this last respect it resembles D. The initial letters of sections stand out in the margin and are larger than the rest. That these marginal letters referring to the sections larger and smaller, are *a prima manu* we have no doubt. Whatever difference there may be between the forms of some letters in them and the forms of the same letters in the text, is easily accounted for, without supposing a later hand. Dr. Barrett seems to have had no idea of a different person; nor would any one who carefully examines the MS. itself.

With regard to orthography, the interchange of the vowels and dipthongs ε and αι, ι and ει is frequent. In Matt. xvii. 17 we have also ε for α in διεστρεμμενη, and *vice versa* α for ε in

Matt. xi. 7. *Delta* is also written for *theta* in Βηδφαγῆ, just as in the cod. Alexand. Βηδσαϊδα. Hug observes* that he met with the following Alexandrine forms of words, λημψεται, Matt. x. 41; προσεπεσαν, vii. 25; ἐξηλθατε, xi. 7, 8, 9. To these may be added λημψονται, xx. 10, the space for the μ being now vacant; and λημψεται, x. 41, where the space for μ is also vacant.

The age of the original MS. has been carefully investigated by the editor, who assigns it to the sixth century, an opinion in which other critics commonly coincide. The text agrees well with this period, for it resembles that found in the most ancient and valuable documents. Although so much mutilated in every page, it is most useful in supplying the chasms of A. C. and D. Tischendorf gives an accurate list of the portions included in it, expressing his belief that more could be deciphered. If the Giobertine tincture were applied to it, it is very likely that many more words might be brought out. Since these remarks were written, we hear that leave has been given to revivify the MS. by a chemical test. The MS. was a *purple* one at first.†

Γ *Cod. Vaticanus.* These six leaves of the purple MS. with silver letters, belong to the same codex as J. and N. They contain fragments of Matthew's gospel in xix. 6-13; xx. 6-22; xx. 29—xxi. 19; and were collated by Gaetanus Marini. Tischendorf has published them entire with a facsimile, in his "Monumenta Sacra inedita." Their age is the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century. As the name imports they are now in the Vatican.

Δ *Cod. Sangallensis.* This is a Greek-Latin MS. of the four gospels, in the library of St. Gallen in Switzerland, containing the four gospels in Greek with the Latin interlinear,

* Einleit. vol. i. p. 245.

† See Evangelium secundum Matthaeum ex codice rescripto in Bibliotheca Collegii ss^ae^ Trinitatis juxta Dublin, 1801, 4to.

and deficient only in John xix. 17-35. The codex is on vellum, in quarto.

The Greek letters are uncial, not the large uncial of the fourth and following centuries, but a sort of uncial approaching the later cursive. The Latin is much smaller than the Greek. But the height as well as the breadth of the letters varies very much. In every line are one or more letters much larger than the rest, ornamented with different colours. The words are separated from one another, and there are frequent dots between them, not always inserted for the purpose of preventing misconception or uncertainty where the division into words might have been doubtful in an exemplar written continuously, but sometimes inserted *arbitrarily*, as will appear to any one who reads a single page of the MS. Hence no argument can be derived from these dots to shew that our codex was copied from another written *continuously* in which guiding marks had been inserted to prevent misconception. In one part, viz. Mark's gospel, there is a point at the end of every word.

There are no accents or spirits, except at the beginning of Mark, where several traces of them appear. But the accents are placed there very incorrectly. It would seem that both accents and spirits were just beginning to be written when the MS. was made.

The text is divided into στίχοι which begin with a large letter; but a dot is not always found at the end of a στίχος.

The Latin cannot be properly called the old Latin or *ante-hieronymian* version, but it is rather the Vulgate altered, patched, and ignorantly meddled with. It is full of mistakes, and of no value—without any independent character.

As the same hand wrote both the Latin and the Greek, and as the Latin character is the Anglo-Saxon, it might be supposed that the MS. was written in Scotland or Ireland. But the scribe may have been a Scotchman or Irishman and not have

written the codex in his own country. This is the likelier supposition; for though Rettig* has enumerated the various particulars which might be thought to point to Ireland, he does not think them conclusive in favour of that country having been the birth-place of the MS. itself. The MS. was probably written in Switzerland, where we suppose it to have always been; for it is well known that many Irish monks went from their own country and either founded monasteries in Switzerland and other parts, or else became inmates of them. They were preceptors and teachers in those establishments.

Rettig has endeavoured to shew that the MS. was written by various scribes, one part by one, and another by another. Though the writing is similar, yet there are minute distinctions and other things which make it probable that more than one person was employed in copying it. But that must have been at the same time, and may have been in the same place, different boys in the one monastery having been taught by the same master. It serves to corroborate this conclusion, that the character of the text differs in different parts; so that various sources appear to have been used. In Mathew's gospel the text is valueless; but in Mark's it resembles much the readings of B. and L., *i.e.* the most ancient and best readings. But though the text in Mark be so much superior to that in the other gospels; yet it seems to have been written by two transcribers; the first careful and accurate; the second hasty and negligent. Many letters are confounded with one another, which is the case in most MSS. Thus ει and ι, αι and η, η and ι, αι and ε, η and ν are often interchanged. In addition to these, other letters are similarly confounded. The same kind of mistakes are found in the Latin, of which Rettig has given examples.

There are marginal notes of various kinds. Some relate to the numbers of the Eusebian canons and Ammonian sec-

* Prolegomena in Antiquiss. quat. evang. cod. Sangall. &c. &c.

tions. Others refer to the subjects treated of. There are two places in which the name Gottschalk is found. The name Aganon also occurs in places relating to asceticism, so that Aganon is identified with the bishop of Carnota, who died in 841, having rebuilt the monastery of St. Peter en Vallée. The close relation between the *cod. Boernerianus* and this one has not been unobserved. The same description applies to both, for their characteristic peculiarities are the same. Thus grammatical notes are inserted among the words of the Latin version in both; many marginal notes are the same in both; both texts indicate the arguments at the margin; the same words are untranslated in both; and the same mistakes occur in them. These things show that they have a near affinity. Indeed they are parts of the same MS., for in addition to the similarities collected by Rettig, it has been found that *the same* later hand has written on leaves now belonging to both, thus proving that they were once together. And the leaves wanting in the one are found in the other. There can be no reasonable doubt therefore that they are parts of one and the same codex. The MS. was not collated by Scholz, who does not appear to have visited St. Gall monastery. He does not say what prevented him from getting a collation. After some difficulty it was lent to Rettig, who made a fac-simile, and prepared the whole for publication, with learned prolegomena and annotations at the end. The work appeared with the following title "*Antiquissionus quatuor evangeliorum canonicorum codex Sangallensis Graeco-Latinus interlinearis nunquam adhuc collatus, &c. &c. curavit H. C. M. Rettig. Turici*, 1836, 4to."

⊖ *Cod. Tischendorfianus* 1. This fragment, consisting of four leaves, the third of which is almost gone, was brought from the East by Tischendorf. The leaves contain Matt. xiv. 8-29 (xiii. 46-55 being almost lost), xv. 4-14. They are attributed to the middle or end of the seventh century, and were published by Tischendorf, with a fac-simile, in his

"Monumenta Sacra inedita." He deposited them in the library of the University of Leipzig.

ℵ *Cod. Sinaiticus.* This appellation has been given by Tischendorf to two fragments very much mutilated, which he saw in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, on the cover of an Arabic book. The one fragment contains Matt. xx. 8-15; the other Luke i. 14-20. Tischendorf attributes them to the beginning of the ninth century. All that he could read in the mutilated fragments he published in the Wiener Jahrbücher for 1846.

CHAPTER XXI.

CURSIVE MSS.

In this chapter we shall notice a few of the best cursive MSS.

1. This MS. contains all the New Testament except the Apocalypse. It is on parchment, in octavo, marked *Basileensis* B. vi. 27, in the library of the University at Basel. Wetstein, who first described and collated it, though it had been used by others before, says that the text of the gospels does not agree with the *textus receptus*, as in the Acts and epistles. It has in that part an ancient type of text, and is therefore important. Tregelles collated the gospels.

13. This is a parchment MS. in quarto of the twelfth century, containing the four gospels, with various chasms which are specified by Scholz. It is incorrectly written; though the text is of the more ancient type. It was cursorily collated by Kuster and Wetstein; more accurately by Griesbach and Begtrup. The codex is in the Royal Library at Paris, where it is now numbered 50.

22. This is a parchment MS. in quarto of the eleventh century, containing the four gospels, with some chasms. The text is correctly written, and is of the Alexandrine

character. It was collated by Wetstein and Scholz, and is numbered 72 in the Royal Library at Paris.

33. This MS. on parchment, in folio, of the eleventh century, contains all the New Testament except the Apocalypse. It contains a part of the prophets, the epistles, Acts, and gospels. Almost all the extremities of the leaves are injured by damp, or torn, and the leaves themselves put into disorder by a blundering bookbinder. It has been collated by Wetstein, Griesbach, Begtrup, in part, and by Scholz, entirely, as he says. But Tregelles, who has collated the MS. with great care, says that Scholz is very inaccurate in his readings.* The text is of the ancient type called Alexandrine. In the Acts and Catholic epistles it is numbered 13; in the Pauline epistles 17. It is deposited in the Royal Library at Paris, where it is marked 14. Eichhorn calls it "the queen among cursive MSS.," † an appellation it deserves on account of its primary importance.

69. This MS., partly on parchment and partly on paper, embraces the entire New Testament, with some gaps. It is commonly assigned to the fourteenth century, though the text is of the ancient form. Mill collated it hastily. It was afterwards more accurately, but yet not thoroughly collated by Jackson. The codex belongs to the public Library of Leicester. In the Acts it is marked 31; in the Pauline epistles 37; in the Apocalypse 14.

102. This number characterises a few fragments in a MS. deposited in the Medicean library at Florence, from Matt. xxiv.—Mark viii. 1. Wetstein procured a collation of them.

106. This is a MS. on parchment, containing the four gospels,

* See Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, July 1850, p. 228.

† Einleitung, vol. v. p. 217.

and belonging to the tenth century. It was collated by Jackson. The text is said to be Alexandrine, and often to follow the later Syriac version. The codex is in the library of the Earl of Winchelsea.

118. This MS. is on parchment, in quarto, and contains the four gospels. It is mutilated at the beginning and end, for it begins with Matt. vi. 3, and ends with John xvi. 25. Another more recent hand has supplied what was wanting. It is assigned by Griesbach, who described and accurately collated it, to the thirteenth century.* The codex is now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It was formerly numbered *Marshi*, 24.

124. This is a parchment MS. in quarto of the twelfth century, containing the four gospels. It is mutilated in Luke's gospel. The text approaches the antique form, but it has some singular readings. It has been collated by Treschow, Alter, and Birch, and belongs to the Imperial Library at Vienna, *Nessel.* 188.

131. This is a Vatican MS. (360) containing the Gospels, Acts and Epistles. It is on parchment, in quarto, and belongs to the eleventh century. Formerly it belonged to Aldus Manutius, who made use of it when he was printing the Greek Testament. The text is somewhat singular in the character of its readings. In the Acts it is marked 70; in the Epistles 77. Scholz is incorrect in calling it 6 in the Apocalypse when it wants that book.

142. This is also a Vatican MS. (1210) on parchment, in duodecimo, of the eleventh century, containing the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Psalms. It was collated by Birch and Scholz. In the Acts and Catholic epistles it is marked 76; in the Pauline epistles 87.

157. This is a Vatican MS. (2) on parchment in octavo, belong-

* Symbolae Criticae, vol. i. p. 202, et seq.

ing to the twelfth century, and containing the four gospels. The text seems to have been taken from ancient codices. It was collated by Birch and Scholz.

209. This is a MS. on parchment in octavo, of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, containing the whole of the New Testament. It is now in Venice. The text is good, especially in the gospels. Birch and Engelbreth collated it. In the Acts and Catholic epistles it is marked 95, in the Pauline 108, in the Apocalypse 46.

346. This is a MS. on parchment in quarto, of the twelfth century, containing the gospels, with a chasm in the fourth. It is now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan.

435. This MS. on parchment is in quarto, and contains the four gospels with some chasms. The text is of the Alexandrine type. It was collated by Dermout, and belongs to the library of Leyden University, marked *Gron.* 131.

---

40. This MS. on parchment in quarto of the eleventh century, contains the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse. The end of the epistle to Titus, Philemon, and the Apocalypse are by a later hand. It was collated by Zacagni, and is now in the Vatican, numbered *Alexandrino-Vaticanus* 179. In the Pauline epistles it is 46, in the Apocalypse 12.

73. This is a Vatican MS. (367) on parchment in quarto, belonging to the eleventh century, containing the Acts and Epistles. It was collated by Birch, and in some places by Scholz. In the Pauline epistles it is marked 80.

81. This is a parchment MS. in folio of the eleventh century, containing the Acts and Catholic epistles, with a commentary. The text is of the ancient type. Birch collated it in some places. It is in the Barberinian Library at Rome, No. 377.

96. This codex is also on parchment in quarto, of the eleventh century. It contains the Acts and Epistles with a Latin and Arabic version, as also Philemon, and has been collated by Rinck. It is in Venice. In the Pauline epistles it is numbered 109.

114. This MS. is on parchment in quarto, belongs to the thirteenth century, and contains the Acts and Epistles with several of the Old Testament books. It has been collated very cursorily by Scholz, and is in the Royal Library at Paris, No. 57. In the Pauline epistles it is numbered 134 by Scholz.

137. This MS. is on parchment in quarto, belonging to the eleventh century. It contains the Acts and Epistles, the text being chiefly what is termed the Alexandrine. In the Pauline epistles it is marked 176. The codex is in the Ambrosian Library at Milan.

142. This is a parchment MS. in duodecimo, belonging to the twelfth century, containing the Acts and Epistles. It is in the library at Munich (243). In the Pauline epistles the number belonging to it in critical editions is 178.

---

47. This MS. on parchment in quarto, belongs to the twelfth century, and contains Paul's epistles with Scholia. It is in the Bodleian at Oxford, where it is marked *Roe* 16.

53. This fragment is on parchment, folio, containing part of the epistle to the Hebrews. It belongs to the tenth century, and is in the public library at Hamburgh, where it is marked *Uffenbachianum*. The text is ancient and valuable. An exact description of it was given by Hencke, but it had been used before by Bengel and Wetstein. Tregelles says that he collated

it twice as carefully as he could.* According to Scholz, this fragment is written in the uncial character, which is rightly queried by Tischendorf.

55. This MS. is of the eleventh century, and contains not only the Pauline epistles, but the Acts (No. 46). It is in the library of Munich.

64. This fragment contains parts of the epistles to the Corinthians, and is evidently of the same age and character as the Uffenbach fragment in Hamburgh, No. 53. Indeed there is little doubt that both belonged to the same codex. These leaves are now in the British Museum, *Harleianus* 5613.

73. This MS. contains the Acts (No. 68), as well as the Pauline epistles. It was collated by Auriville, and is attributed to the twelfth century. It belongs to the library of Upsal.

137. This MS. contains not only the Pauline epistles, but also the Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypse. It is mutilated in some verses of the epistle to Philemon. It was first collated but cursorily by Scholz, in the Royal Library at Paris, where it is numbered 61. In the Gospels it is 263, in the Acts 117, in the Apocalypse 54, according to Scholz's notation.

---

31. This MS. is on paper, and belongs to the fifteenth century. It contains the Apocalypse and the works of Dionysius the (so-called) Areopagite. A collation of the first eight chapters was communicated to Griesbach for his second edition. The codex is in the British Museum, numbered *Harleianus* 5678.

38. This is on cotton paper, and contains the Revelation, with some works of the fathers. It is in octavo, and be-

* See Kitto's Journal for October 1850, p. 451.

longs to the thirteenth century. It was collated by Birch and inspected by Scholz. The text is considered very valuable, as it agrees with the most ancient MSS. A. and C. In the Vatican it is marked 579.

41. This is also on paper, and belongs to the fourteenth century. It contains the Revelation with some other works. Birch collated it; and it was also inspected by Scholz. It is marked *Alexandrino-Vaticanus* 68.

51. This MS. was written in the year 1364, and contains all the New Testament. It was collated throughout in the Revelation by Scholz. The codex is in the Royal Library at Paris, No. 47. According to Scholz's notation it is 18 in the Gospels, 113 in the Acts, 132 in the Pauline epistles.

Upwards of five hundred cursive MSS. of the Gospels, ranging in date from the tenth to the sixteenth century, have been inspected more or less cursorily, or at least mentioned. More than two hundred of the same kind contain the Acts and Catholic epistles; upwards of three hundred the Pauline epistles; one hundred have the Apocalypse. Very few however have been properly described and fully collated. By far the greater number have been *hastily inspected.* The list, large as it is, might be much increased; for there are many in the great public libraries of England and the continent of Europe as yet unknown. Much as has been done in the way of making known and collating MSS., future labourers may add greatly to the stock of existing materials.

CHAPTER XXII.

EVANGELISTARIA AND LECTIONARIA.

We have already explained the nature of what are termed *Evangelistaria*, which are MSS. containing lessons from the four gospels adapted to the Sundays and festivals in the year. Of these codices a great many have been inspected, but few carefully collated throughout. Scholz mentions 123 new ones, of which one only was collated entire, five in the greater part, twenty-seven in select places, twenty-nine cursorily, and sixty-one merely named. These 123, added to such as had been mentioned or used before Scholz, make 178. Additional ones have been discovered and inspected by Tischendorf, of which he promises some account. The most important of these Evangelistaria are those in uncial characters, of which about fifty are known. Even they however have not been properly applied to criticism or thoroughly collated.

It is not easy to ascertain the exact age of *uncial evangelistaria*, because the ancient letters were retained for ecclesiastical purposes several centuries after the cursive character had become general. Some of them however are both ancient and valuable. Two *rescript* ones which are mere fragments—one at Venice, the other in the Barberinian Library, are assigned to the seventh century. One which Tischendorf has deposited

in the Leipzig Library called *Tischendorfianum V.* belongs to the eighth or ninth century; and probably a few others. The greater number however were written after the tenth century. Most appeared in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

There is one, *the Carpentras* which Tischendorf praises for the goodness of its readings, and which is undoubtedly ancient, though not as old as the sixth century, nor to be converted into a MS. of the four gospels, as it has been. Another in the monastery on mount Sinai is also praised by the same critic for its magnificence. To this may be added the *cod. Harleianus* 5598 in the British Museum which is a very splendid Evangelistarium, with letters gilt, coloured, and ornamented, written in the tenth century according to a notice in the last page; and the *Arundel codex* 547 in the British Museum, which is also very splendid, having many of the initial letters beautifully illuminated, and as old at least as the *Harleianus* if not older.

In regard to the text of the Evangelistaria, it is substantially the *textus receptus* or later Byzantine, in far the greater number of these codices. But in a few, the text is valuable and of the antique type, coinciding with E. F. G. H. S. U. V.

Similar codices or lesson books taken from the Acts and epistles are called *Lectionaria* or Lectionaries. Fifty-eight of these stand in Scholz's list. But few of them are written in uncial letters. We know of two only, one at Leyden which contains also an Evangelistarium, in Arabic and Greek, another at Treves. To these may be added a small fragment deposited by Tischendorf in the library of Leipzig University, Tischendorfianus VI. F. containing a few verses of the epistle to the Hebrews.

In relation to the gross number of Evangelistaria in the

cursive character, it is upwards of 150. When to this are added about 50 uncial ones, we have about 200 in all. Of Lectionaries there are about 60, to which may be added three uncial ones. But very little is known of these codices, with the exception of a few. They have not been fully described or collated. The places where they are deposited are given in the late editions of Scholz and Tischendorf; but little else.

CHAPTER XXIII.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON MSS.

With regard to MSS. of the New Testament, we believe that editors of the Greek Testament from Mill to Scholz have not acted on the best plan. They have unnecessarily multiplied codices. Aiming too much at *number*, they have heaped together an immense mass of materials which is useless to a great extent. The cursive MSS. in particular need not have claimed so much attention; or at least, might have been postponed till the older ones had been well examined. But since the time of Lachmann's first edition, a check has been put to the accumulation of *late* materials; and properly so. The first thing to be done is to collate the oldest, thoroughly and accurately. Let their texts be published in *fac-simile* or otherwise. If not, they should be collated in such a way as that no future critic may be under the necessity of resorting to them again and re-examining them. The uncial MSS. ought to be well known and fairly applied to the purposes of criticism. All the rest, or the great mass of the junior ones, may be dispensed with. They are scarcely needed, because the uncial are numerous. At present they do nothing but hinder the advancement of critical science by drawing off to them time and attention which might be better devoted to older documents. A line should be drawn somewhere, beyond which an editor should not go in citing codices. Why resort, for

example, to copies of the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries before giving the readings of copies belonging to the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth? By all means let us have the latter first; and *if* the former be then judged necessary, they may be produced. The attention of critical editors must therefore be more concentrated. They should devote themselves to the thorough elucidation of fewer and selecter materials. How little has been done by Scholz, after the years and labour expended on MSS. and versions, is known to every scholar. In aiming at too much, he did little that can be relied on for its accuracy. His collations are perpetually distrusted—so superficial and hasty were they. How useless his critical notes are, compared with what they might have been, had he taken fewer documents and examined them well. Hence we are glad to find that Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles proceed in a different way, by leaving very much out of view the great majority of MSS. belonging to a recent age, and exhibiting with accuracy the readings of the oldest. They have thus sifted and separated the materials. We are persuaded that their principle is a right one; whatever may be said of the modes in which they apply it. The criticism of the Greek Testament has gained a great deal in this way. It has made an important step in advance since the time of Griesbach. Critics have discovered a better way than Scholz's diffuse, perfunctory method.

Till ancient codices of the Greek Testament have been thus satisfactorily collated and applied, we should deem it advisable not to meddle with *Evangelistaria* and *Lectionaries*. It is true that these have never been much attended to or examined. Nor should they, especially at the present day, when older and better documents are not yet fully known.

In considering all that has been done in the department of MSS., the number, variety, and importance of those described, with the array of readings extracted from them, the first idea

that arises in the mind is a feeling of gratitude for the advantages we enjoy. Many laborious, indefatigable men have addressed themselves to the task, repulsive and wearisome as it is, with persevering zeal, and have placed within our reach the readings of valuable documents. We owe them our thanks. But in examining, comparing, and applying the extracts thus furnished there is great difficulty. Rules are all but worthless. Theory can be of little avail. The judgment, tact, and taste of every man must be mainly relied on.

MSS. are useful in the first instance in pointing out readings that have intruded into the original text. By their help we may detect interpolations which do not form a proper part of the primitive text. Thus when they all agree, or the great majority of them, in exhibiting a certain reading, there is good reason for attaching weight to their testimony, and for suspecting any form of the text their concurrent voice does not sanction. No alteration or corruption has taken place where the testimony of MSS. is unanimous or nearly so. There we may safely conclude that the genuine text is before us. But when they exhibit the same passage differently, some change has been made in the text. There has been an interpolation, omission, or transposition of words. Diversity of reading in the great body of MSS. at a certain place, indicates the existence of corruption in some of them. Where there is not diversity, there is of course no corruption. Thus a collation of MSS. at once exhibits corruption.

In restoring passages which have been altered from their original condition, MSS. must be used with caution and wise discrimination. In this respect they are not so useful or satisfactory as some perhaps might suppose.

The first thing to be ascertained in a MS. is its age. This is determined by the style of the letters, uncial or cursive; by the accents, divisions, punctuation marks, marginal accompaniments, inscriptions, and subscriptions, as well as other

circumstances in the MS. itself. In general it is not difficult to find out the true date or nearly so. It may be approached within half a century or so with tolerable certainty. In regard to uncial MSS. the opinions of the best critics do not differ more than a century. Having fixed the respective dates of the MSS. employed, the rule that the reading of an older copy is preferable to that of a later one, *ceteris paribus*, comes into operation. The nearer a document approaches the age of the original, it is natural to infer that it has undergone fewer alterations. Frequency of transcription has operated less in deteriorating its text than in others of a later date. The fewer hands it has passed through, the fewer changes we suppose to have been made in the text.

After determining the age of a MS. the next consideration is the internal condition of its text. There may be circumstances whose tendency is to lessen the authority derived from age. Thus a later document which has certainly been copied from a very ancient one will have more value than an earlier taken from an exemplar of no great antiquity. A MS. of the eighth century, for example, may have been immediately transcribed from one of the fifth, and therefore the former is entitled to greater weight than one belonging to the seventh century transcribed from an exemplar of the sixth. The MS. of the fifth century whence that of the eighth was derived may have been comparatively unknown till the time it was brought forth from its obscurity to be the parent of another. In such a case the MS. of the eighth century may be considered of higher antiquity than the oldest existing one of the sixth, because it was immediately made from a more ancient exemplar. This exception to the rule that the older the MS. the better it is, is however more apparent than real. It can scarcely be called a *real* exception. The fact can only be discovered from internal evidence.

Another circumstance which modifies the authority conse-

quent upon age alone is the degree of accuracy with which the MS. was written. A copyist may have been very ignorant or negligent. His carelessness may be apparent. In proportion to the care or negligence he used will be the authority of the document. It is an important thing in the estimate of a MS. to find that it was written with a laudable endeavour after accuracy of transcription from the original source.

Still more depends on the characteristic readings of a codex. Good readings constitute the best criterion of its goodness. These imply slight faults and variations, as well as few departures from the primitive text. They also imply the existence of a good copy at the basis of the text. As to the principles on which a good reading is to be determined, they are laid down in another place.

In determining the character of a MS. it is not unusual to refer to the country where it was written, as a fact not to be overlooked. But this is not always readily discovered. Critics are divided in regard to this point. Some prefer eastern, others western ones. Thus Scholz gives the preference to the former; Lachmann, Griesbach, and others to the latter. Little however can be made of mere locality apart from other considerations. Probably the Egyptian or Alexandrine are the best. But it should be observed here as affecting country, especially Alexandria, where there were so many learned men in the early times of Christianity, that the acquaintance of a copyist with the language of his MS. is not necessarily or always an excellence. His very knowledge might prompt him to alter places with the design of improving them. This indeed is a thing which cannot be always ascertained; and therefore it throws a degree of uncertainty over passages occurring in MSS. of a particular kind.

Thus a genuine reading cannot be determined by the mere antiquity of one or more documents in which it is found. Antiquity is doubtless valuable as affording a presumption in

favour of the text's purity; but many modifying circumstances must be observed.

The number of MSS. in which a particular reading is found should not be overlooked. This is an obvious and natural rule. The reading of the greater number of MSS. is preferable to that of the less number. But the canon often needs and receives limitation. Mere majority of copies is not sufficient to certify a reading, or to condemn it. Several may have been copied from one and the same codex, and therefore they are only entitled to one voice. They can prove no more than that the reading which they all exhibit was found in their common exemplar. Hence the rule has been laid down, that the majority of MSS. belonging to different classes, or in other words, to different recensions, can alone decide in favour of a reading. We do not see however how this can be usefully applied. The entire subject of recensions is so insecure and intangible, that nothing can be built upon it. It is not easy, even in Griesbach's view, to determine the recension to which every codex belongs. The most eminent scholars differ there. The very same MS. is said to incline to different recensions in different parts; for example, to one in the Gospels; to another in the Acts and Catholic epistles. In others the characteristic readings of more recensions than one are commingled, rendering it difficult to decide which preponderates in the text. When such things are affirmed of a codex, it will be needful to look whether it has received alterations from later hands, or whether it be not derived from various exemplars. Indeed all MSS. require to be looked at with this object, for it is not uncommon to find letters retouched, in which case they have sometimes received a different form from what they had at first, being thus entirely changed; or to find defects supplied by one or more persons different from the original copyist. Many codices have been altered here and there in their progress downward from remote times. Things have been taken into their text which did not stand

there originally. As to recensions, we doubt greatly whether MSS. can be referred to them in such a way as to assist in judging of the value of readings found in individual copies.

The authority of such codices as have been called *critici* is not equal to that of others bearing the same age. Having been compiled from several MSS., instead of being faithful transcripts of single copies, they cannot be equivalent in goodness to such as owe their existence to one parent. These eclectic copies may contain good and ancient readings, without affording a criterion to judge of the current text at the time and place they first appeared in.

Lectionaries or lesson-books intended for public ecclesiastical use are not placed in the same rank with other codices as to value, because they were more exposed to alteration. They must have been oftener copied, and therefore they were more liable to errors of transcription.

On the whole, the right of judging on these points belongs to those who have carefully inspected MSS. The eyes must be practised in the various forms of letters; and the mind must be habituated to the investigation of critical questions. General observations may lead the novice to think that the determination of the right reading is an easy matter in most cases; but practice will soon shew the reverse. Though MSS. are the most important class of materials for bringing back the New Testament text to its pristine state, even *they* are not so definite or authoritative as we could wish. In detecting corruptions their great utility is unquestionable. There they are of primary and preëminent value. But in replacing the true readings they are of less assistance of themselves. Yet they are the most credible witnesses for the express words of the original writers, though they do not satisfy all expectation. And to them must all editors of the original look as the basis of that text which came from the hands of the inspired authors. A reading which occurs in no MS. must be powerfully attested in another way to recommend it as true.

CHAPTER XXIV.

QUOTATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN ANCIENT WRITERS.

The third source of textual criticism consists of quotations or extracts made from the New Testament by the fathers. We shall begin with *Greek* writers.

1. Clement of Rome wrote an epistle to the church at Corinth, in which are many references to the New Testament. It belongs to the close of the second century.
2. Ignatius of Antioch is supposed to have written seven epistles; at least seven have been circulated in his name. But it is highly probable but only three of them are genuine, and that too, not as they exist even in the shorter Greek recension, but as they are found in an ancient Syriac version published by Cureton. They afford very little assistance in settling the Greek text of the New Testament.
3. We have already spoken of Justin Martyr, who belonged, as well as the preceding writers, to the second century. It is likely that he quotes the Gospels and Epistles, but in a peculiar way. Two apologies and the dialogue with Trypho the Jew are admitted as authentic; others are disputed.
4. Irenaeus bishop of Lyons wrote five books against

heresies, most of which are only extant in a Latin translation. Hence his quotations are serviceable for the correction of the old Latin version, the *versio vetus*, which the translator followed, rather than for the revision of the Greek text. If we compare the few remaining Greek fragments with the Peshito, we may perceive that the Asiatic text was by no means uniform. It differed even at that time in different copies. The best edition of his works is that of Stieren.

The elders or seniors spoken of in Irenaeus may be distinguished from himself in relation to the text. Most of their fragments exist only in Latin. They were collected by Routh,* and published separately. (Seniores apud Irenaeum.)

5. Theophilus of Antioch wrote an apology for the Christian religion in three books to Antolycus. His citations are very inexact, as they are almost always made from memory.

6. Marcion was born in Pontus, and occupies a chief place among the heretics of the church. Fragments of his works exist in Epiphanius and Tertullian, which were collected and published by Hahn.† But Hahn's work needs now to be supplemented and corrected. It will be seen from former remarks that Marcion's readings should be employed with great caution.

7. From the fragments of Valentinus and what is said of the Valentinians, some readings have also been derived. We learn their opinions however only in the works of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen.

8. In like manner Heracleon the Gnostic, one of Valentinus's followers, may be of use. We know his treatment of the text only from the fragments in Origen's Com-

* Reliquiae Sacrae, vol. i. p. 41, et seq. first edition.

† Das Evangelium Marcion's in seiner ursprunglicher Gestalt, u. s. w.

mentary on John, which should be received with caution, for it is not likely that all Origen's complaints and accusations against Heracleon are well founded.

9. The epistle of Barnabas furnishes very small assistance in revising the text. It has been quoted however for this purpose.

10. There is an encyclical letter of the church at Smyrna respecting the martyrdom of Polycarp which has also been applied to criticism. It is printed in Hefele's edition of the apostolic fathers, and elsewhere.

11. An epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians contains numerous quotations from and allusions to the New Testament. But part of it exists only in Latin. It is also contained in Hefele's edition.

12. Tatian a native of Syria or Assyria, wrote many works, of which the only extant one is the treatise πρὸς Ἕλληνας. In this however there is little that can be used in the criticism of the text. Unfortunately his *Diatessaron* or Harmony of the Gospels was early lost. He is said to have rejected and mutilated some of the New Testament writings.

13. Theodotus we know as a writer only by a treatise professing to be excerpts from him, printed in the second volume of Potter's edition of Clemens Alexandrinus. As to the person who made the extracts, whether Clement or some other, nothing is known. The treatise contains a number of citations from the gospels, but in such a way as does not shew what readings Theodotus had in his MS. Griesbach's collation of Clement includes the excerpts of Theodotus.

14. The work called "the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs" is one of the early apocryphal writings. Its use in criticism is but small.

15. Ptolemy the Gnostic wrote an epistle to Flora preserved in Epiphanius. It contains some citations from the

New Testament, but they appear to have been made from memory. And Stieren has endeavoured to shew that the letter was not written by one person, but two.* The work entitled πίστις σοφία preserved in Coptic and attributed to him, is probably spurious. It is now published.

16. Athenagoras, an Athenian by birth, and teacher in the school at Alexandria, is the author of an apology for Christianity and a treatise on the resurrection. His citations in them from the New Testament are few and unimportant.

17. Clemens Alexandrinus wrote much that is now valuable in relation to the New Testament text. Although he was often misled by his memory in quoting passages, yet he doubtless followed his MS. in many places. The frequent agreement between his readings and those of the old Latin version has been often noticed. Griesbach made a collation of his works from the index in Potter's edition. He does not profess however to have read them throughout for the purpose.

These are the writers and works belonging to the second century cited in critical editions of the Greek Testament. The most prominent and important are Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria. The rest might be omitted with very little disadvantage.

THIRD CENTURY.

18. Origen is in many respects the leading theological writer of the third century. Griesbach made a very careful collation of his works for the purpose of New Testament criticism, in his *Symbolae Criticae*, vol. ii. Many of his writings exist only in an old Latin version. In

* De Ptolemaei Gnostici ad Floram epist. Jenae, 1843.

these Latin portions Griesbach's collation is very imperfect. It is true that the Latin interpreter of Origen should be quoted for the old Latin version rather than for Origen; but even in this respect the readings of the Latin are valuable. In the Corinthian epistles, the commentary of Rückert will help to supply the collation made by Griesbach from De la Rue's edition of this father. Buttmann in Lachmann's larger edition of the Greek Testament has also supplied and corrected Griesbach's labours in some things. There is little doubt that Origen had various Greek MSS., and attended to the text more closely than any of his predecessors; but he generally wrote in haste, or rather dictated to others who wrote down his words.

19. Fragments of the works of Ammonius, an Alexandrine, exist only in Catenae.
20. Archelaus was a Mesopotamian bishop who held a *disputation* with Manes. Most of the fragments of it exist only in Latin, and are unimportant. They are contained in Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae, vol. iv.
21. The work called the "Apostolic Canons," published in Cotelerius's edition of the Apostolic fathers is of little use in criticism.
22. The "Apostolic constitutions" contained in the same work are of more utility.
23. There is a "Dialogue against the Marcionites," printed in the Benedictine edition of Origen's works which has been applied to this subject. It is unimportant.
24. Dionysius of Alexandria has several readings which have been quoted. The remaining fragments of his works are published in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. iii. and Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae, vols. ii. and iv.
25. Hippolytus, a presbyter of Antioch, who in Rome attached

himself to the Novatian party, was the author of numerous writings, containing many New Testament quotations. In his extant works the Apocalypse is most quoted.

26. Methodius was bishop of Tyre. There are only fragments of his works remaining.

27. Petrus or Peter of Alexandria. There are only fragments of his writings preserved which have been published by Galland. in his Bibliotheca, vol. iv. and Routh, Reliquiae Sacrae, vol. iii. They contain a good number of quotations not of much value.

29. Gregory Thaumaturgus bishop of Neo-Caesarea in Pontus. His published writings do not contain much that is useful in the criticism of the text.

30. Porphyry wrote against Christianity, but his work was destroyed. The extracts preserved by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, contain very little that can be applied to textual criticism.

The principal writer of this century is Origen, whose works are far more valuable than all the rest together. Indeed the others might easily be dispensed with.

IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

31. The works of Athanasius bishop of Alexandria have many verbal quotations from the New Testament, which shew the Alexandrine condition of the text at his time. They seldom agree with the *textus receptus*. Works which have been falsely attributed to him, in *both* Greek and Latin, are cited under the appellation of *Pseudo-Athanasius*.

32. Amphilochius of Iconium wrote various treatises, some of which have been lost. Those short pieces and fragments published as his by Combefis (Paris 1644, folio)

and Galland. (Biblioth. vol. vi.) are suspicious. It would seem that he quoted from memory, or used Constantinopolitan MSS. only.

33. Antony was an Egyptian monk. His *opuscula*, translated from the Arabic into Latin, and published by Galland. (vol. iv.) contain several quotations from the New Testament.

34. Apollinaris the younger of Laodicea wrote various commentaries which are mentioned in Greek catenae. A few fragments are all that remain.

35. Arius wrote a letter respecting his views to Eusebius, which is extant. But it contains little available for the criticism of the text.

36. Asterius of Cappadocia wrote comments on Scripture, and tracts in favour of Arianism, of which only fragments remain, printed by Galland. (vol. iii.) He generally gives the sense of Scripture without adhering to the words.

37. Basil, surnamed the great, bishop of Caesarea, wrote a great many works, most of which still remain, consisting of discourses, homilies, letters, &c. But the mode in which he referred to Scripture is so loose that we can scarcely tell the state of the text as he read it. His quotations are free, not literal.

38. Caesarius of Constantinople, brother of Gregory Nazianzenus, is said to have written four dialogues on 195 questions in theology. It is doubtful however whether those published be his (Galland. Biblioth. vol. vi.)

39. Cyril of Jerusalem wrote lectures, &c., theological and didactic, in which the sacred text is largely interwoven. But he seems for the most part to have relied on memory; and his citations are of such a kind as to be of little use in criticism.

40. Didymus of Alexandria wrote commentaries and many

other works, of which few survive, and those mostly in a Latin translation. His blindness from youth compelled him to quote Scripture from memory. Guerike has collected readings from two of his works.*

41. Of the writings of Diodorus of Tarsus only abstracts and extracts remain, preserved by Marius Mercator, Photius, and others.

42. Dorotheus of Tyre wrote various works, fragments of which are found in catenae. His readings agree with the received text.

43. Gregory of Nazianzum is the author of orations or sermons, epistles, and poems. In these he seldom *quotes* the New Testament. His readings agree for the most part with those of Gregory Nyssene.

44. Gregory of Nyssa, younger brother of Basil the great, is the author of numerous discourses and polemic treatises, published at Paris 1638, 3 vols. folio, and by Galland. in his Bibliotheca (vol. iv.) His works abound with quotations from Scripture, most of which are very free. Hence criticism can derive little assistance from his citations.

45. Epiphanius was bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, and wrote chiefly against heresies. The best edition is still that of Petavius published at Paris in 1722, folio. It is not very often that he quotes the New Testament literally.

46. Ephrem a Syrian bishop and voluminous writer of commentaries on Scripture, wrote in his native language, but his works were early translated into Greek. They have not been used as yet for critical purposes as they ought.

47. Eusebius bishop of Caesarea wrote many important works, of which his *Preparatio evangelica*, *Demonstratio evangelica*, and *Historia ecclesiastica*, are best known.

* De Schola quae Alexandriae floruit, catechetica, part ii. p. 33.

His quotations from the New Testament are numerous, and were apparently made with care. There is little doubt that he used Alexandrine copies of the Greek Testament, or copies which had undergone some revision there.

48. Eusebius bishop of Emesa was supposed by Augusti to be the author of three discourses which the latter published in 1829, and which Scholz treats as his. But Thilo proved that they belong to a later person of the same name. The same critic makes it probable that the two books *De fide adv. Sabellium*, printed by Sirmond among the opuscula of Eusebius of Caesarea, belong to the present writer. They have not yet been employed for critical purposes, nor are they of any consequence in this respect.*

49. Eustathius patriarch of Antioch wrote a work against the Arians, of which only fragments remain, published by Galland. (vol. iv.)

50. Evagrius, a native of Pontus, afterwards deacon, and monk in the Nitrian desert, wrote various works, of which some are extant only in a Latin version, others in fragments. All are published by Galland. in the seventh volume of the Bibliotheca. As far as we can judge, his text is substantially the Constantinopolitan.

51. Hesychius was presbyter at Jerusalem, and wrote a great many works, some of which are extant entire, others in fragments, while others have been lost. But his writings have not been much applied to the criticism of the text.

52. Macarius, an Egyptian monk, is the author of a number of homilies or discourses published by Pritius at Leipzig in 1714. Many fragments are also preserved

* See Gieseler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 357 (English translation.)

in catenae and printed in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. vii.) Their authorship is not well established.

53. Meletius of Antioch does not seem to have written much. What has been preserved of his works is contained in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. v.)

54. Pamphilus of Caesarea in Palestine wrote an apology for Origen in five books, only the first of which is extant in the Latin translation of Rufinus. It is in Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae (vol. iv.) His citations agree with Origen. The Pamphili passio printed by Galland. in his Bibliotheca (vol. iv.) also affords some readings.

55. Serapion was bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, and wrote a work against the Manichaeans printed in Latin in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. v.) It contains readings worth noting.

56. Theodore bishop of Heraclea in Thrace wrote various expositions and commentaries, fragments of which exist only in catenae. His citations belong to what has been termed the Constantinopolitan recension.

57. Theodore of Mopsuestia was a distinguished biblical commentator, but most of his writings have been lost. Various fragments have been published, and in recent times several complete works and fragments by Angelo Mai, Fritzsche, and others. As yet they have *scarcely* been applied to textual criticism, where they would doubtless be of more assistance than many other writings of the fourth century.

58. Of Theodore the Egyptian, belonging to Pelusium, a few unimportant fragments are all that remain.

59. Theophilus of Alexandria wrote various letters and episcopal charges, published by Galland. in the Bibliotheca (vol. vii.) There is very little quotation of Scripture in them.

60. Timotheus of Alexandria wrote some unimportant works which are now lost, except a few fragments.

61. Titus of Bostra wrote three books against the Manichaeans, extant in a Latin translation in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. v.)

62. Chrysostom wrote voluminously on the New Testament. His commentaries are important. But great caution must be used in applying them to criticism. He was more of the orator than the grammarian or expositor; and therefore neglected the exact words of Scripture. He has fallen into many mistakes from trusting to memory, from aiming at elegance rather than accuracy, and from haste, impetuosity of mind, or carelessness. There is little doubt also, that earlier and later readings are mixed up in his homilies *as now printed.* He has suffered greatly from transcribers at different times, who altered his Scripture quotations according to the text current in their time. This can be shewn in part from catenae. Chrysostom is also largely indebted to Origen and perhaps others, whose remarks he copied. The best edition of his works is that of Montfaucon. The editor who has contributed most to a good collation of this celebrated father is Matthaei, who has given extracts from MSS. But much remains to be done; though Tischendorf has since carefully examined Chrysostom's readings in the greater part of the Acts and the Pauline epistles.

The chief writers of this century whose works are available for critical purposes are Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ephrem Syrus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Chrysostom. These afford a wide field for collation; and most of them would repay the labour of extensive examination. All the rest might be neglected without loss.

IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

63. Antiochus was bishop of Ptolemais in Phenicia. Fragments of his works are quoted in catenae.
64. Basil, bishop of Seleucia, is the author of orations written in a very florid style. Little aid in criticism can be derived from them.
65. Cyril of Alexandria wrote expositions of Scripture, polemical treatises, sermons, and letters, which contain many citations from Scripture. Vater has shown his adherence to the Alexandrine recension.* His works were published by John Aubert in 7 parts folio, 1638, Paris.
66. Marcus Diadochus, probably an Egyptian bishop, author of a treatise against the Arians, printed in Latin in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. v.) Those who identify him with Diadochus bishop of Photice, place him in the fifth century. But though even Tischendorf recently does so, we believe that he is in error. He belongs to the fourth century.
67. Eutherius bishop or archbishop of Tyanea is author of some epistles and sermons containing several citations from the Greek Testament.
68. Euthalius, deacon at Alexandria, wrote an analytical introduction to the books of the New Testament, published by Zacagni at Rome in 1698, 4to. It is useful in the criticism of the text.
69. Gelasius of Cyzicus, an island in the Propontis, wrote an ecclesiastical history. It is not of much use in criticism.
70. Gennadius of Constantinople is often quoted in catenae.
71. Isidore of Pelusium was a voluminous writer, as we have

* Spicilegium ad usum patrum Graecorum in critica N. T. 1810.

still 2013 excerpts from his letters. Many citations from the New Testament occur in them; but none which are not found in later Alexandrine authors. The letters are divided into five books, and were all published by the Jesuit Schott at Paris, 1638, folio.

72. Diadochus of Photice, a disciple of Chrysostom, wrote a few tracts on practical piety, printed in Galland. (vol. viii.)

73. Nestorius of Constantinople wrote various works, most of which, with the exception of a few extracts, have perished. Few citations in these fragments are of much value in criticism.

74. Nilus of Constantinople, afterwards an Egyptian monk, wrote a great many epistles and some treatises, which were published by Suares at Rome, 1673 folio. They contain many quotations from the New Testament, but very few literal ones.

75. Nonnus of Egypt wrote a paraphrase or poetic version of John's gospel, which has sometimes been quoted in the criticism of the text. But it is of little use in this respect.

76. Theodoret bishop of Cyrus was a distinguished writer in this century. Among his works and commentaries, his comments on Paul's epistles belong to the criticism of the New Testament text. His readings however present little that is peculiar, because he was dependent on Origen, and still more on Chrysostom. They agree on the whole with the *oriental* class. The best edition is the Halle one of Schulze and Noesselt, 1768-1774 8vo.

77. Philo of Carpathus. What remains of his writings is printed in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. ix.)

78. Proclus bishop of Constantinople wrote sermons and epistles published by Ricardi, and also by Galland.

(vol. ix.) Some assistance in criticism may be derived from them.

79 Socrates of Constantinople is the author of an ecclesiastical history in seven books. It is however of very little use in criticism.

80. Sozomen of Constantinople is likewise the author of an ecclesiastical history in nine books, which has been quoted a few times in the criticism of the text.

81. Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, is known chiefly as a polemic writer. His extant works contain various citations from the New Testament (Galland. Bib. vol. ix.)

82. Victor of Antioch wrote a commentary on Mark's gospel. His citations of the text do not commonly differ from those of the *received* edition.

Here we may add the *Synopsis of Sacred Scripture* printed with the works of Athanasius, as it probably belongs to the end of the fifth century. The readings are Alexandrine.

The most important writers for critical purposes in this century are Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Euthalius, and Isidore of Pelusium. The rest are of comparatively little consequence.

IN THE SIXTH CENTURY.

83. Anastasius Sinaita. Under this name various writings, consisting of Questions and Answers, Homilies, &c. are published in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. xii.) The Scriptural quotations in them are mostly made from memory.

84. Andreas bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which is commonly printed

along with Chrysostom's works. The most careful collation of it was made by Tischendorf.

85. Cosmas, commonly termed Indicopleustes, an Alexandrine monk, wrote a work on *Christian topography* in twelve books. His readings are of course Alexandrine.

86. For the remains of the writings of Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, which are of little consequence, we refer to Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. xii.)

87. Macedonius bishop of Constantinople. It is said by Liberatus that he corrupted the gospels and 1 Tim. iii. 16.

88. Procopius of Gaza wrote many commentaries on the Scriptures, but they are mostly on the Old Testament, and mere compilations from preceding authors.

89. The commentaries of Severus, bishop of Antioch, are preserved only in fragments, in the *catenae patrum*.

The commentary of Andreas of Cappadocia is alone of importance in this century. The other writers are of very small utility.

IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

90. Andreas, archbishop of Crete, wrote Homilies, Hymns, &c. published by Combefis at Paris, 1644 folio. The Scriptural citations in them are neither numerous nor important.

91. Leontius of Byzantium wrote a number of polemical treatises. They are printed in Galland's Bibliotheca (vol. xii.)

92. Maximus, a monk at Chrysopolis near Constantinople, wrote a great number of small treatises, polemic and dogmatic, moral and monastic, besides some commentaries, published by Combefis at Paris 1675, in two folio volumes. His readings belong to the eastern class.

93. Thalassius, monk in the desert of Libya, wrote several tracts, of little use in criticism. He is quoted in *catenae*.

To this century also belongs the Paschal or Alexandrine Chronicle, last edited by Dindorf at Bonn, 1832. Its readings are of course Alexandrine.

Maximus is the chief writer in this century for critical purposes.

IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

94. Johannes Damascenus or John of Damascus, a monk in the monastery of St. Sabas, wrote numerous treatises, chiefly polemical. His principal work is a system of theology derived from the fathers, and arranged in the manner of the schoolmen. His writings were published by Le Quien at Paris 1712, 2 vols. folio. His commentaries on Paul's epistles are chiefly dependent on Chrysostom; and it is clear that he quoted carelessly.
95. Elias of Crete wrote commentaries on the orations of Gregory Nazianzen, and other works. They have been very slightly examined for purposes of criticism.
96. Georgius Syncellus wrote a Chronicon, which was published by Goar, Paris, 1652 folio. It is of little use in criticism.
97. Tarasius patriarch of Constantinople, to whom the former writer was *syncellus*, wrote several letters extant in the collections of councils (Galland. vol. xiii.)
98. Theodore Studites, a monk of Constantinople, wrote catechetical discourses and other tracts, edited by Sirmond. They are of little value in criticism.

Of most importance in this century for textual criticism is Johannes Damascenus.

IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

99. Arethas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which is usually printed with the works of Œcumenius. It is of considerable value in the criticism of the text, and was collated throughout by Tischendorf for his second critical edition of the Greek Testament.

100. Photius patriarch of Constantinople was a very voluminous writer. Where he quotes the New Testament he does it carefully and literally. His works were printed by Galland. (Biblioth. vol. xiii.), some by Scotti, others by Mai; and many are yet in MS.

IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

101. Œcumenius may either have belonged to this century or to the preceding one. He is said to have been bishop of Tricca in Thessaly. The commentaries which have been published in his name are upon the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic epistles, and the Apocalypse. Tischendorf who examined these (except the Apocalypse) very carefully for his second edition says, that the text is not well edited. They are useful in textual criticism.

102. George Cedrenus, a monk of Constantinople, compiled a chronicle which was published by Fabrotus and Goar, Paris, 1647 folio. It is of little consequence for critical purposes.

103. Michael Psellus, a senator at Constantinople, wrote several commentaries and many tracts on a great variety of subjects. But they are rarely quoted for criticism.

104. Suidas a lexicographer may sometimes be consulted

with advantage, more however for interpretation than criticism.

105. Theophylact was bishop of Bulgaria, and wrote, or rather compiled from Chrysostom, commentaries on the gospels, Acts, and all the epistles, both Pauline and Catholic. The Venice edition of his works by de Rubeis and Finetti 1754-1763, 4 vols. folio, is the best. Several portions have been recently discovered and made known in MSS. belonging to the Vatican and the Medicean Library at Florence. These commentaries are valuable in criticism, and have been very diligently examined again by Tischendorf.

In this century Œcumenius and Theophylact are both valuable.

IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

106. Euthymius Zygabenus of Constantinople is the author of commentaries on the gospels and Psalms, with many other works, some of which have not been printed. He did not write commentaries on any other part of the New Testament except the gospels, the best edition of which was that of Matthaei in three volumes, 1792.

107. Glycas a Byzantine historian is chiefly known by his *Annals*, divided into four parts. His letters, some of which were published by Lami, relate to theological subjects. According to Scholz, who collated them, he quotes from memory where he departs from the *received* text.

108. Theophanes a Sicilian bishop, is the author of homilies, some of which were published at Paris, 1644 folio. He agrees with the received text.

109. Zonaras of Constantinople wrote, among other works,

commentaries on the apostolic canons, on some canonical epistles of the Greek fathers, and on the canons of the councils. But his quotations of Scripture though numerous, are scarcely ever literal.

Here Euthymius Zygabenus and Zonaras, are the best for criticism.

IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

110. Chrysocephalus, who is placed by some in the fourteenth century, wrote catenae and homilies. But his commentary on Matthew is his most important work. It is still in MS., part of it in the Bodleian.

IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

111. Gregorius Palamas, monk in one of the monasteries of Mount Athos, was a copious writer, but his published works have as yet been very little applied to criticism.

112. Theodulus (Thomas Magister) is too late to be of use.

CHAPTER XXV.

EXTRACTS FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT IN LATIN WRITERS.

We shall arrange the Latin fathers alphabetically.

1. Agapetus, a deacon in Constantinople in the sixth century, wrote *Scheda Regia*, instructions addressed to Justinian. The book contains few quotations from the New Testament.
2. Alcimus or *Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus*, archbishop of Vienna in the fifth century, wrote various poems, epistles, and homilies, many of which have perished. Fragments only remain. His works were printed by Sirmond at Paris 1634, 8vo, and are of little use in criticism.
3. Ambrosius, bishop of Milan in the fourth century, wrote numerous works including commentaries on Scripture, which were published by the Benedictines at Paris 1686, 1690, in two vols. folio. He has many quotations from the New Testament, but very few which are really useful, or from which the genuine text can be ascertained. Depending very much on the Greek interpreters, he must be classed on this account with those writers who belong to the Alexandrine school.
4. Ambrosiaster in the fourth century, is a name given to the writer of commentaries on Paul's epistles (except

that to the Hebrews). This writer, who was formerly thought to be Ambrose, is commonly supposed now to have been Hilary the deacon. If the text were more correctly edited, this work would be more serviceable in criticism. As it is, the Venice and Roman editions frequently differ; so that it is very difficult to discover the authentic reading of the author. When Scholz affirms that Hilary uses the Greek text of the Alexandrines and old Latin versions, he conveys a very erroneous impression. Passing over Ansbertus in the eighth century, and Apringius or Aprigius in the sixth, who are of no consequence, we come to

5. Arnobius, an African author, who wrote a treatise against the Gentiles in seven books, published by Orelli at Leipzig, 1816, two vols. 8vo. There are few scriptural quotations in it.
6. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, in the fourth century, quotes very many passages from the New Testament, but from the old Latin version, chiefly the Itala revision of it. The best edition of his works is the Benedictine, in eleven volumes folio, Paris 1679-1700.
7. Bede in the eighth century must have had the Greek text before him, for he gives the readings of Greek MSS. in many places, particularly in the Acts of the apostles, where he often agrees with E. (Cod. Laudianus in the Acts). His works were published at Cologne in eight volumes folio, 1688.
8. Caesarius of Arles, in the sixth century, wrote on moral subjects, and therefore his works are of little or no use in criticism. They are in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. xi.
9. Cassian, belonging to the fifth century, did not write much that can be applied in criticism, though his works

are numerous, occupying a folio volume published at Frankfort in 1722.

10. Cassiodorus, in the sixth century, was a voluminous writer, and some of his works may be advantageously consulted by the critic, especially his short comments on the Acts, the Epistles, and Apocalypse.
11. Claudius, bishop of Turin in the ninth century, wrote commentaries on the greater part of the New Testament; but none have been published except that on the Galatian epistle.
12. Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia in the fifth century, wrote several homilies on the New Testament, printed in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. viii. but unimportant in a critical view, as he used the Latin version.
13. Columbanus, a monk in the sixth century, wrote various treatises, &c. relating to monachism, of no consequence to critics.
15. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage in the third century, is too well known as an author to require any particular description in this place. In his works, which were best edited by Baluze and Prud. Maranus, Paris, 1726 folio, are found very many quotations from and allusions to the Scriptures. It would appear however that he usually cited from memory, or from the old Latin version current in Africa.
16. Epiphanius called *Scholasticus*, at the beginning of the sixth century, translated into Latin various Greek works.
17. Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the fifth century, wrote several works, including homilies.
18. Fastidius, a British bishop in the fifth century, wrote a tract which was printed in the Bibliotheca of Galland. vol. ix.

19. Faustus, a Manichaean in the fourth century, wrote a book which Augustine quotes and refutes. It is of little or no use in criticism.
20. Faustinus, a presbyter at Rome in the fourth century, wrote on various theological subjects. His works are in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. vii.
21. Facundus, an African bishop in the sixth century, wrote various treatises contained in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. xi.
22. Julius Firmicus Maternus, in the fourth century, wrote a book on the falsehood of the pagan religions, which is included in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. v.
23. Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, in Africa, at the beginning of the sixth century, wrote various theological works of some value, which are inserted in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. xi.
24. Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia in the fourth century, wrote various discourses and tracts, which deserve to be collated. He quotes the old Latin version.
25. Nothing more than extracts remain of the treatises of Gildas of Britain in the sixth century which relate to Scripture. His only entire work now existing is *historical.*
26. Gregory the First, or the Great, a leading writer in the sixth century, followed the old Latin version without neglecting Jerome's revision of it. His numerous works, occupying four folio volumes, Paris 1705, contain many quotations from Scripture.
27. Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt in the ninth century, is the reputed author of Commentaries on Paul's Epistles and the Apocalypse, besides others on the Old Testament. But they are mere compilations from earlier writers.
28. Hieronymus or Jerome, in the fourth century, is well

known as the most learned of the fathers. His writings are of more importance in criticism than those of all the other Latin fathers together. He mostly used the Greek text, of which he had doubtless various MSS.; sometimes the old Latin version which he revised; and his own translation. The best edition of his works is that of Vallarsi in eleven volumes folio, Verona 1734-1742. We need scarcely say that they form an indispensable part of the apparatus required by a critic.

29. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in the fourth century, wrote a number of theological treatises, in which are frequent references to Scripture. He used however the old Latin version. Scholz says that he had Greek MSS. before him; but as he was but imperfectly acquainted with Greek, this assertion may be doubted. His works were published by Scipio Maffei at Verona, in two volumes folio, 1730.
30. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims in the ninth century, was a celebrated and leading writer in his day. In criticism however, his works are of little use.
31. Jacobus of Nisibis in the fourth century is said to have written the discourses and synodical letter inserted by Galland. in Armenian and Latin in his Bibliotheca, vol. v.
32. Juvencus of Spain, in the fourth century, wrote in poetry four books of evangelical history, inserted in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. iv. He quotes the Latin version.
33. Lactantius, a native of Italy, who flourished in the fourth century, and an elegant Latin writer, composed his *Divine Institutions* in seven books. This and his other writings are in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. iv. He used the old Latin version.
34. Leo, the first or great, bishop of Rome in the fifth century,

wrote many sermons and epistles, which have been best published by the brothers Ballerini at Verona, in three vols. folio, 1755-1757. He used the old Latin version.

35. Liberatus, archdeacon at Carthage in the sixth century, wrote his *Breviarium*, which may be consulted with advantage by the critic.

36. Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in the fourth century, was the author of various theological treatises and epistles, which were published in the best form by the brothers Coleti in a folio volume at Venice 1778. The scriptural quotations in them are numerous and valuable. Lardner says that he has largely quoted the Acts, the epistle to the Hebrews, the second epistle of John, and almost the whole of Jude's epistle. Unquestionably he used the old Latin version. Whether he employed the Greek also is doubtful. The Alexandrine character of many of his readings may be accounted for without supposing him to have consulted the original.

37. Marius Mercator, a controversial writer of the fifth century, who opposed the Pelagian and Nestorian doctrines, has many scriptural quotations, but it seems that he used the Latin version. His works are in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. viii.

38. Martin the First, bishop of Rome in the seventh century, wrote various epistles, some of which are extant and have been published, but they are of little use in criticism.

39. The works of Maximus bishop of Turin in the fifth century consist of short homilies, and are included in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. ix. It is evident that he used the old Latin version.

40. Novatian, a Roman presbyter in the third century, wrote various theological treatises, in which are very few quotations from the New Testament, and those made

from memory. His works are contained in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. iii.

41. Optatus, bishop of Milevi in the fourth century, wrote a polemic work against the Donatists, inserted in Galland. vol. v. He seems to have used the old Latin version.
42. Orosius, a Spanish presbyter belonging to the fifth century, is known as the author of a history and other works in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. ix. He used nothing but the old Latin version.
43. Pacian, bishop of Barcelona in Spain in the fourth century, wrote various tracts and treatises, which are included in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. vii.
44. Paulinus, bishop of Aquileia in the eighth century, was the author of various polemical works, which may be consulted with some benefit in criticism.
45. Pelagius, in the fourth century, wrote commentaries on the Pauline epistles (except that to the Hebrews), which are found in a very mutilated state among the works of Jerome. Sabatier refers to him under the name of the *Scholiast of Jerome.*
46. Philastrius was bishop of Brescia in the fourth century, and wrote a book respecting heresies in 150 chapters, which contains various quotations from the Scriptures, but in the old Latin version.
47. Phoebadius of Agen, in the fourth century, in his work against the Arians inserted by Galland. in the Bibliotheca, vol. v., quotes the old Latin version.
48. A work called Praedestinatus s. Praedestinatorum Haeresis, contains various unimportant scriptural quotations. It was once improperly ascribed to Vincentius of Lerins.
49. Primasius, an African bishop in the sixth century, wrote among other works a commentary on Paul's epistles, and an exposition of the Apocalypse.

50. Prosper of Aquitain, in the fifth century, used the old Latin version.
51. Prudentius of Spain, in the fourth and fifth centuries, was a poetical writer on religious subjects, of small ability.
52. Rufinus of Aquileia, belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries, wrote some histories, various commentaries and treatises, &c., which are not of much utility. He used the old Latin version.
53. Ruricius bishop of Limoges, belonging to the fifth century, wrote several epistles contained in Galland's Bibliotheca.
54. The works of Salvian, presbyter at Marseilles, belonging to the fifth century, are included in the Bibliotheca of Galland. vol. x. He used the old Latin version.
55. Sedulius, a writer and poet in the fifth century, is of no consequence in criticism.
56. Siricius, bishop of Rome in the fourth century, wrote various epistles which are contained in the Bibliotheca of Galland. vol. vii.
57. Tertullian of Carthage, in the third century, is too conspicuous a writer to require any lengthened notice here. In his various writings we see the form of the old Latin version as it was then circulated about Carthage; but his citations are made negligently, and not without alteration. His work against Marcion is useful in regard to the text of Luke's gospel; but it should be employed with great discrimination. The best edition is that of Semler published at Halle 1769-1773, 1776, completed in six volumes 8vo.
58. Tichonius, an African belonging to the fourth century, wrote rules for explaining Scripture, which are contained in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. viii. A commentary on

the Apocalypse, quoted under his name, does not belong to him.

59. Valerian, a bishop in the maritime Alps, belonging to the fifth century, wrote homilies and an epistle inserted by Galland. in his Bibliotheca, vol. x.
60. Victor Vitensis, an African bishop of the fifth century, wrote a history of the persecutions in Africa under the Vandals; of little or no use in criticism.
61. Victor of Tunis, in the sixth century, wrote a *Chronicon*, part of which remains, and is inserted in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. xii.
62. Victorinus Philosophus or the philosopher, an African by birth, belonging to the fourth century, wrote among other works, commentaries on the epistles of Paul and the Apocalypse. Those on the Galatians, Philippians, and Ephesians were first published by Mai, in the third volume of his *Scriptorum Veterum nova collectio*, p. 265, et seq.; and that on the latter is in Galland's Bibliotheca, vol. viii. As this writer used the old antehieronymian version, his commentaries which quote it are valuable in shewing the old Latin text of his day.
63. Vigilius of Tapsus in Africa, in the fifth century, is the author of numerous theological treatises. He used the old Latin version.
64. Zeno bishop of Verona, in the fourth century, also used the old Latin version in the sermons he wrote, which are found in Galland. vol. v.
65. Zosimus, bishop of Rome, who flourished in the fifth century, wrote epistles which are inserted by Galland. in his Bibliotheca, vol. ix.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THIS SOURCE.

This source of evidence has been decried by critics like

Matthaei, as if nothing certain or useful could be deduced from it. We do not share in this extreme opinion. Mill was right in using it even in opposition to the sentiments of his patron; and subsequent editors, not excepting Lachmann, have retained it as legitimate. The extent to which it should be employed, as well as the mode of its application, and the weight allowed to it, *may be* differently judged of, and *have been* variously determined; but the source itself has not been discarded or neglected. Taking it as a whole, it is not of so much weight or utility in criticism as MSS. Its authority is inferior to them. Codices occupy the first rank. Neither is it of the same consequence as the most ancient versions. We should not place it on an equality with them, for they occupy the next position to MSS. But quotations from the works of ecclesiastical and ancient writers constitute an evidence of themselves which has its determining value.

Yet comparatively little profit has hitherto accrued from this source of criticism. It has been unduly extended. Too many writers have been comprehended under it. It has been followed down to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. And besides, a multitudinous class of men have been collected and their works examined for the purpose. The consequence has been, that amid the vastness of the field little real culture of any one portion of it has taken place. All the writers have been very cursorily inspected. How indeed could it be otherwise? What critic can be supposed to have looked into the voluminous works of sixty or seventy authors? Can he be said to have *collated* them for readings? The thing is impossible. So far from this, hardly a single ancient writer has been yet examined as he ought to be, by a single scholar. We believe that too large a field was taken even by Mill and Wetstein. Griesbach's is also too great. In the hands of Scholz it swelled out to a greater extent—with what advantage to his text—let the text itself declare. And in Tischendorf's

edition, what a host of authors, Greek and Latin, is enumerated; few of whom he has ever looked at. It is therefore in compliance with the example of Griesbach, Scholz, and Tischendorf, rather than in consequence of our own conviction, that we have given the preceding list of writers. We believe that it should be *very materially* abridged in two respects. It should be curtailed in the centuries it embraces, as well as the number of writers contained in it. For, in the first place, the first five centuries are sufficient. The writers who belonged to them are by far the most important. All later ones might be dispensed with, except as several of them are necessary (ex. gr. Theophylact) to give us extracts from the leading fathers of more ancient times. And in the second place, a selection of *the most important* ecclesiastical authors in each century should be made. At present, obscure and unimportant ones are included, whose works are not worth the labour of a thorough examination. Having effected this necessary curtailment and so reduced the multitude to *the leading writers* of the first five centuries, the next thing requisite is to have each one carefully examined by one person. Let some *one* scholar undertake to collate *one* writer, in such a manner as that the writer shall not require a *recollation*, either for the purpose of extending the number of quotations discoverable in his works, or of correcting mistakes made with respect to those already procured. We want a *thorough collation* of each writer's works. To ensure greater accuracy, it is desirable that one person should confine himself to one author; but if he be competent and disposed to collate more, let him by all means do so. The sooner such satisfactory collations of all the chief writers are made, the better for criticism. Till now, New Testament criticism has been very deficient here. It has fared badly in this respect. The only approach to the thing recommended has been made by Griesbach, with regard to Origen. The labour which that immortal critic spent upon the works of the

Alexandrine father was immense. Had others done as much for other ancient writers, how different would have been the aspect of criticism in this department. But the example of Griesbach is a solitary one.

We trust that the influence of Lachmann's edition will lead to the abridgment we have recommended. There is no need to imitate the restriction of the Berlin philologian; nor would it be wise to do so. His range of authorities should be extended. But we are persuaded that he did right in breaking away from the current practice here, as he did in attempting to form a text irrespectively of the *textus receptus*. And we are much mistaken if the path he so boldly entered be not hereafter followed.

There is little doubt that the number of various readings derived from this source has been greatly multiplied from want of attention to the needful cautions and limitations. The list has been much augmented, owing to a variety of causes. Could we ascertain with certainty the reading which each ecclesiastical writer had in his copy at a particular place, the present heap would be diminished. It needs *sifting;* for it is doubtless replete with inaccuracies. Another plan must be adopted before it be in a right state.

In collecting readings from the works of the fathers, they must be distinguished into Greek and Latin, according to the languages they wrote in. Greater weight should be given to the former than to the latter, because they quoted from the Greek text itself, whereas, with some exceptions, the Latin writers quoted Scripture according to their established version, *i. e.* the *Latin*. The most ancient Latin fathers quoted the *versio vetus* in the particular recension of it which circulated in their district or which they preferred; the later ones were in the habit of quoting Jerome's revision of the old Latin, commonly called the *Vulgate*. Hence their citations are primarily and properly witnesses for the readings of the Latin version.

They bear on the original Greek text *indirectly ;* not *primarily* and *directly* as the citations of Greek fathers who employed the original itself. Thus it is easy to perceive, that less value belongs to the citations of the Latin fathers, because the latter were generally unacquainted with the Greek text itself and used a Latin version. The same remark applies to the Syrian fathers. Ephrem employed a Syrian version. Perhaps he did not know Greek.

Among the Latin fathers, those deserve most attention who appear to have understood Greek, and to have been in the habit of consulting Greek copies. Here Jerome is a prominent example. Hilary of Poitiers may also be mentioned. Augustine had some knowledge of Greek ; but he does not appear to have used Greek copies.

Rules have been given for making extracts from the writings of the fathers. But they are of little moment. Indeed they hardly deserve the name ; for they are rather *cautions* to be observed by critics lest they go wrong. They are more of a *negative* than *positive* kind. We shall sum up in the following observations all that we believe to be useful on this topic. They are the best hints and suggestions which we have been able to put together as the result of reading and reflection. Though they may appear common-place, they are not to be despised. Plain as they are, they will approve themselves as pertinent :—

1. The best edition of each ecclesiastical writer should be used. This is of primary importance. There are correct editions ; and there are corrupted ones. What is in all cases wanted is one critically and correctly edited from the best available MSS. Many have not been edited as they should. But the best existing one should be procured. There is little doubt that these writings have been altered in many cases, either by editors or copyists. They were made to agree with the text before the editors or copyists themselves, or with that

which they preferred. No works have suffered so much as those of Chrysostom.

2. The readings found in the *most ancient* fathers should be preferred. But though antiquity has proportionately greater authority, there are limitations to it, especially in this instance, that ought not to be overlooked. There are circumstances which neutralise its value. The remaining monuments of the first two centuries are few. They also contain little that can be applied to critical purposes. And the writers of these centuries had little idea of a correct text, or the desirableness of revising it. They were very uncritical, allowing all kinds of glosses and changes to remain in the text, without solicitude.

3. The authors should be diligently considered as to *their learning* or erudition. The well-instructed fathers deserve more attention than the ignorant. Those whose attainments were respectable, whose habits were accurate, whose judgment was good, should be preferred. Nor should the creed of the church to which they belonged and the nature of the copies that prevailed in the region they inhabited be neglected. The natural abilities, acquired attainments, and theological atmosphere of the fathers must not be overlooked.

4. The great object is, to ascertain the reading which they actually found in the MSS. they used. The copies they possessed were more ancient than any now extant. Hence by means of their citations we may see older readings than we can obtain from any other source. But it is not easy in many instances to tell the particular reading contained in their copies. They often trusted to their memory in citation. By this means they committed mistakes in giving the words of Scripture. They also quoted *paraphrastically*, exhibiting *the general sense* of a passage rather than *the precise words.* Sometimes they have a mere allusion to a passage, a general reference, rather than a citation. They also *accommodated* passages to the pur-

port or thread of their discourse by changing them. Some they condensed; others they expanded. They quoted, too, part of a passage—such words only as related to the subject in question—which they incorporated with their own language. It is certain that they both *added* and *subtracted.* In some cases, critical conjecture was resorted to. Their own opinions were proposed.

These considerations will shew the difficulty of finding the *real, direct testimony* of the fathers with relation to varieties of reading. Allowance must be made for them by the critic. Lapses of memory, loose paraphrases or *allusions* rather than *citations properly so called*, the substitution of synonymous phrases for those employed by the sacred writers, additions, omissions, change of the order and construction observed in the original, all kinds of accommodation, as also emendations or conjectures, must be carefully attended to.

5. The different classes of writings should be attended to. There are *commentaries* or expositions of Scripture. There are also *polemical* treatises. There are likewise *practical* works intended for edification.

In regard to *commentaries*, it is indubitable that the author had a copy or copies of the New Testament before him from which he quoted accurately. This is specially the case when the words of Scripture are repeated and explained.* The same observation applies to all the sections of considerable length which we find among the writings of the fathers, not only their *exegetical*, but also their *doctrinal* and *polemical* ones. When the fathers wrote down these long lessons or Scripture paragraphs, they must have transcribed them from a copy they had before their eyes.†

Again, those quotations must be considered accurate which expressly appeal to MSS., or have a declaration associated

* See Griesbach's Dissertatio critica de codic. quat. evang. Orig. in his Opuscula by Gabler, vol. i. p. 278, et seq. † Ibid, p. 281, et seq.

with them to the effect of *such a reading and none other* being right.*

Still farther, quotations in which parallel passages are given and compared together, must be deemed accurate.†

If a passage be quoted oftener than once in the very same manner, we can hardly doubt of its being accurately cited. But if it be quoted differently in different places, that reading must be generally preferred which is found in the greater number of the citations.‡

If citations agree with ancient Greek MSS. still extant, it is clear that they were accurately extracted from copies accessible to the writer. The same holds good when they agree with ancient versions, or the citations of other ecclesiastical authors.§

Doctrinal and controversial works containing citations from Scripture do not generally furnish so much aid as exegetical ones. In polemical works especially, the fathers were not scrupulous or accurate in their use of Scripture. Not that this is always the case; for there are some who in handling controversial topics, or refuting erroneous tenets, shew very clearly what readings they found in their MSS.

Homilies and hortatory writings are of least use; for in them citations are usually loose and inaccurate. But some of the fathers, as Origen, were alike accurate in all their works, expository, controversial, or hortatory.

6. The omission of a passage in the works of the fathers does not always shew that it was wanting in the copies used. We must not rashly conclude from their silence that these authors were ignorant of any particular reading, or that they judged it spurious. Yet the silence of the fathers generally respecting an *important* passage renders it suspicious, as in the case of 1 John v. 7.

* See Griesbach's Dissertatio critica de codic. quat. evang. Orig. in his Opuscula by Gabler, vol. i. p. 285, et seq. † Ibid, p. 286, et seq.
‡ Ibid, p. 292, et seq. § Ibid, p. 294, et seq.

7. When the same passage is quoted in the same manner by *many* fathers, the evidence is strong that the passage is genuine, as they exhibit it. The evidence becomes stronger in proportion to the *number* and *character* of the writers, as well as the *number* and *character* of consenting MSS. and versions.

8. It is hazardous to admit a reading as authentic which is destitute of any other authority than that of ecclesiastical writers.

It is usual to class the writings of the heretics and enemies of Christianity along with those of the fathers. And they are rightly so placed. With due restrictions and caution, the same rules are applicable to them. This is true of the *Acts of councils*, which have also been applied to criticism. Perhaps however the last mentioned writings have been oftenest tampered with by transcribers and editors.

We had thought of appending examples to the preceding remarks, but want of space compels us to forbear. In the meantime Griesbach's essays may be referred to for illustrations.* None has investigated the writings of Origen with equal care. We may also send the reader to Wetstein's treatise *Libelli ad crisin atque interpretationem Novi Testamenti*, edited by Semler, along with the latter's review of Bengel's *Introductio ad Crisin*.† In regard to Irenaeus, Michaelis's *Tractatio critica de variis lectionibus Novi Testamenti*, &c. is valuable.‡ But the study of Griesbach's *Symbolae criticae* with his *Commentarius criticus*, is the best preparation for him who desires intelligently to apply this source of criticism to the emendation of the text. None had more sagacity than Griesbach in this department; and we need not say that sagacity and judgment are important qualifications in a critic.

* Dissertatio Critica de codicibus quatuor evangeliorum Origenianis, in Griesbach's Opuscula by Gabler, vol. i. p. 226, et seq.

† Published along with Ridley's Dissertation on Syriac versions, in 1766, at Halle.

‡ See pp. 21-26.

CHAPTER XXVI.

CRITICAL CONJECTURE.

ANOTHER source of correction is said to be *critical conjecture.*

In the New Testament, critical conjecture has been very little exercised. This is as it should be. There is no need for it there. We have many distinct MSS.; and wherever one is defective, the parts wanting may be supplied from another. Ancient versions also, belonging to different countries and ages are at our disposal, from which we may gather the original text. Quotations in the writings of the fathers are within reach. Thus the materials for procuring a correct, unadulterated text are abundant. With these immense resources now readily accessible, it would be unwise to give scope to ingenuity, or to set bare presumptions above the legitimate sources of emendation. Critical conjecture is rendered wholly superfluous by the very copious array of *proper resources*—so copious, that it will never desert the critic, or leave him at a loss in determining the reading of a particular passage. We do not believe that the true reading has been lost from all existing documents, in any one instance. The thing is at least very improbable.

It is worthy of remark, that none of the critical editors sanction the adoption of conjectural emendations into the text. Even Bentley proposed to exclude them, for he says,—"The

author is very sensible, that in the Sacred Writings there's no place for conjectures or emendations. Diligence and fidelity, with some judgment and experience, are the characters here requisite. He declares therefore that he does not alter one letter in the text without the authorities subjoin'd in the notes." Griesbach in his edition of the Greek Testament was equally scrupulous in refraining from hazarding any conjectures in regard to the text; and later editors have followed his example.

But although it is unnecessary, and therefore improper, to change the Greek words without authority, we may freely put forth our judgment in regard to accents, marks of aspiration, and punctuation, since these formed no part of the primitive text. Here editors have followed their own views. Chapters, paragraphs, verses, clauses, may be very different in different editions, for they are simply matters of opinion on the part of an editor.

If the reader wishes to see the principal conjectures that have been put forth in regard to the New Testament text, he must consult the second volume of Bowyer's Greek Testament, printed in 1763, which has at the end 178 pages containing "Conjectural emendations on the New Testament, collected from various authors." Along with this work he may also take Knapp's edition of the Greek Testament, which has at the end a *sylloge* or collection of the more remarkable and celebrated conjectures, and Michaelis's section, in which he proposes several critical conjectures.* We venture to affirm, that a perusal of these works will do much to shew the uselessness and absurdity of speculating on the subject. The *nature* of the conjectures there given proceeding from good scholars, as they do for the most part, will teach the ridiculousness of forsaking *documents* for such improbabilities. *Difficulty in interpretation* has usually led to them. But it is

* Introduction to the N. T. translated by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 402.

better to interpret a passage as well as we can, or to confess our inability to explain it, than have recourse to the expedient in question.

The following may be taken as examples of conjecture :—

In Acts xv. 20, 29 occurs the puzzling word πορνείας, *fornication*—puzzling we mean in relation to its connection with the other particulars specified. Hence some have thought that the original may have been πορκείας, *swine's flesh*. This requires the alteration of no more than a single letter, and is more plausible than χοιρείας, which has the same meaning. If we were ever inclined to look with favour on a conjectural emendation in the Greek Testament, it was on the former of these two. But no document has it, and it must therefore be discarded.

More mischievous, because proceeding apparently from a theological bias, is the conjecture of Schlichting, approved by Crell and Taylor, of ὢν ὁ ἐπί instead of ὁ ὢν ἐπί in the epistle to the Romans ix. 5. Harwood, in the note to his Greek Testament, calls this "an ingenious conjecture which makes a grand and magnificent climax," but as he candidly allows, it is wholly unsupported.

Of the same kind as the last is Crell's θεοῦ instead of θεὸς in John i. 1, prompted by theological prejudice.

Ἐφρὼν for Ἐμμὸρ is the conjecture of Grotius in Acts vii. 16.

In 1 Corinth. xv. 29, the difficult phrase βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν is sought to be evaded by the conjecture of Valckenaer, βαπτιζόμενοι ἀπ' ἔργων νεκρῶν. This is approved by Venema and others.

In the "Remarks upon a late Discourse of free-thinking" by Bentley, we find him throwing out the conjecture of προσέχει, προσέχεται, or προσίσχεται for προσέρχεται in 1 Timothy vi. 3. In the same place he also speaks of ἀσελγειῶν instead of ἀσεβειῶν, Jude 18.*

* See pages 72, 73, sixth edition.

CHAPTER XXVII.

CRITICAL RULES.

In addition to *external* evidence, *internal* must not be overlooked. Without this it is impossible to prevent the existence of a merely diplomatic or historical criticism which confines itself to a limited range of evidence. Readings must be judged on internal grounds. One can hardly avoid doing so. It is natural and almost unavoidable. It must be admitted indeed that the choice of readings on internal evidence is liable to abuse. Arbitrary caprice may characterise it. It may degenerate into simple *subjectivity*. But though the temptation to misapply it be great, it must not be laid aside. Intuitive sagacity and tact have their value, when kept in due restraint and subordinated to other considerations of a more definite kind. While allowing superior weight to the external sources of evidence, we feel the pressing necessity of the subjective. Here, as in other instances, the objective and subjective should accompany and modify one another. They cannot be rightly separated.

The internal grounds by which the originality of readings is perceived have been divided into various kinds. Thus De Wette speaks of *Exegetico-critical*, *historico-critical*, and *such as arise out of a writer's characteristic peculiarities*.* But it is

* Einleitung, p. 80, et seq.

simpler to speak of all under one head, without minute distinction. We shall therefore describe them all as *internal grounds* by which the genuine reading of a passage may be determined.

1. Those readings should be rejected which yield no meaning, or an improper one. The connexion is regarded as the criterion in judging of what has no sense or an unsuitable one. But here great caution is needed, lest a reading be thought to give no meaning, or an improper one, when that is only its *apparent* character. Thus De Wette pronounces Lachmann's form of the text in Matt. xxi. 28-31 senseless, when it is really not so.* On the contrary, it appears to be the original reading. A *true* example is furnished by the received reading in Romans vii. 6, viz. ἀποθανόντος in the genitive, instead of ἀποθανόντες. Our English translators have in vain endeavoured to make sense of the genitive. Another is found in Romans v. 14, viz. ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτήσαντας instead of μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας. In the same manner 1 John v. 7 disturbs the connection and mars the general sense of the context, as Porson has shown.†

2. The mode of writing characteristic of the sacred authors may be used as a test in judging of the original reading. The one most in accordance with the practice of a writer should be preferred. Thus in Matt. xii. 14 the reading adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf ἐξελθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ is better than that of the received text, because it is in conformity with i. 24; ii. 3; iv. 12; viii. 10, 14, 18; ix. 4, 8, 9, 11, 19; xii. 25; xv. 21, 29; xvi. 5, 8, 13; xvii. 6; xviii. 27, 28, 31, 34. In xix. 3; xxvi. 17 αὐτῷ is rightly omitted after λέγων, since Matthew does not employ in such cases the dative of the person or persons addressed. In John xiii. 24, τίς ἐστιν is preferable to τίς ἂν εἴη, be-

* Einleitung, p. 80, et seq. † Letters to Travis, p. 397, et seq.

cause John does not use the optative. In 1 Corinth. vi. 2, ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε is preferable to οὐκ οἴδατε (Comp. Romans ix. 21; xi. 2; 1 Corinth. vi. 9, 16, 19, κ. τ. λ.)

In the application of this canon, it should be recollected that the practice of each author is not very fixed or definite. His *general* mode of writing may be perceived and defined, without including minute details. Allowance should also be made for fluctuation, arising doubtless from the feeling of freedom inherent in the mind. The sacred writers indulged in the license and variety natural to others; and as they were unconscious of restraint, their style was somewhat shifting. They were not tied down with rigorous uniformity to set phrases or modes of expression; and therefore the rule before us must not be *pressed.*

3. That reading should be regarded as genuine from which all the others may be naturally and easily derived. Thus in 1 Timothy iii. 16, if ὅς were the true reading, the alteration of it into θεός would readily suggest itself to those who knew that the *mystery of godliness* related to the *Divine Word.* And ὅς naturally gave rise to ὅ the neuter, for the sake of grammatical accuracy. But if θεός were the original reading, it is difficult to understand why or how ὅς could come into the mind of critics and transcribers. Still more difficult is it to imagine ὅ giving rise to θεός or ὅς. Hence by this canon ὅς should be preferred.

4. The more difficult and obscure reading should be preferred to the plainer and easier one. Hence we prefer ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ in Matt. v. 22, without εἰκῇ; and οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα in John vii. 39, without δεδομένον or any other addition. For the same reason, we prefer the common reading πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα· πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, 1 Corinth. xv. 51, to that adopted by Lachmann from the Vulgate, or to any form of the passage. So too in Matt. xxi. 7, ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν

is preferable to ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, the latter having apparently arisen from the desire to avoid the difficulty of referring the pronoun to the two animals ὄνος and πῶλος.

5. Harsher readings, that is, such as contain ellipses, Hebraisms, and solecisms are to be preferred to purer ones. Thus δικαιοσύνη is better than ἐλεημοσύνη in Matt. vi. 1. So too ἡ λέγουσα in Rev. ii. 20 is better than τὴν λέγουσαν. In 2 Corinth. viii. 4, the reading δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς, at the end of the verse is an elliptical supplement, which should not be received into the genuine text.

6. Unusual readings should be preferred to those containing usual forms or words. Thus κρυφαίῳ in Matt. vi. 18 is preferable to κρυπτῷ. In like manner ἐσκυλμένοι, not ἐκλελυμένοι, is the right reading in Matt. ix. 36. From this it appears that the canon which is commonly applied to other books can hardly be followed here, viz. that *grammatical accuracy* or *propriety* must be used as a test. The style of the New Testament writers is not strictly grammatical, and therefore it should not be judged by the ordinary rules of grammarians. The critic must be sparing in choosing readings for their correctness or elegance in a grammatical view, else later ones will be adopted. The same holds good of rhetorical grounds, which are also a fallacious test of originality. We should not expect rhetorical elegance, or conformity to the rules observed by polished authors, in the writers of the New Testament. Propriety of sequence, completeness of delineation, fulness and rotundity of style, were qualities unstudied by the sacred penmen. They were not solicitous about sentences constructed according to the precise forms of human rhetoric. Hasty, imperfect, and negligent constructions are found in them. This being the case, it becomes a matter of some moment to forbear deciding on the genuineness of readings by grammatical accuracy or rhetorical propriety, for it happens in not a few instances that the test in question would mislead. Accordingly

we do not agree with those editors who expunge the second ἔτι in Romans v. 6. Lachmann is right in retaining it. Neither should the clause in Romans xi. 6, εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι ἐστὶ χαρις· ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἔργον, which corresponds to the preceding one, and makes the sentence full and complete, be retained as genuine. We should also expunge ἐν τῷ φανερῷ in Matt. vi. 18, and ἀργούς in xx. 6.

7. Unemphatic readings are preferable to emphatic. Thus in the epistle to the Ephesians v. 30, the true reading is ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, without ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. In Mark v. 12, πάντες before οἱ δαίμονες should be expunged. So in Luke vi. 38 ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε is preferable to τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε.

8. The shorter reading is to be preferred to the longer in cases where the latter furnishes suspicion of being an explanatory insertion. Thus from ἀμὴν to ἐκείνῃ in Mark vi. 11 should be expunged from the text. The same should be done to the eleventh verse of Matthew xviii. In the tenth verse of the same chapter, the reading οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσι κ. τ. λ. is preferable to οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ διὰ παντὸς κ. τ. λ.

9. Readings which favour ascetic or monkish piety are suspicious. On this ground we are inclined to prefer the reading μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν in Rev. xxii. 14 to μακάριοι οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. Hence perhaps πρῶτον was omitted in some documents, Matt. vi. 33.

10. Readings which strongly favour orthodox opinions are suspicious. Hence θεὸς in 1 Timothy iii. 16 was made out of ὅς. 1 John v. 7 may also be referred to this head. So too θεὸν inserted in the fourth verse of Jude's epistle. Perhaps the reading θεὸς in John i. 18 instead of υἱὸς belongs here.

11. Readings which yield a sense *apparently* false should be preferred to those which seem more suitable. Thus δεκατεσσάρων should not give place to τεσσάρων in Gal. ii. 1. Ὁ ὕστερος

in Matt. xxi. 31 is preferable to ὁ πρῶτος. Hence the common reading in Matt. xxvii. 9 should not be disturbed. The same remark applies to Acts vii. 15, 16.

These rules, it should be observed, are never to be used by themselves. They are to be applied only where the external evidence is divided, and nearly equally balanced. Where there is reason for doubting on which side external testimonies preponderate, the internal considerations now stated may serve to turn the scale to a certain side. They are not *absolute* rules or *unqualified* canons. If they were, they would be inconsistent with one another. Thus Nos. 3 and 7 seem not to agree when looked at simply *per se*. The utmost caution and care must be used in applying them. Many limitations guide, modify, and restrain their operation. Context, parallels, historical circumstances, an intimate acquaintance with the characteristic developments of sentiment, phraseology, constructions, use of particles, &c. in each particular writer, accompany their exercise. Intuitive sagacity and tact are important qualities in securing their successful use. Much depends on the mind of him who employs them. Critical feeling or sensibility is of importance. Griesbach made a good use of them on the whole. Few critics however can employ them with a judiciousness equal to his.

We may farther remark, that the canons or considerations now described are capable of reduction to a very few. Thus from the fifth till the last are virtually contained in the fourth. They are deducibles from the fourth, or rather the expansion of it into particulars.

We have already given rules for estimating the individual witnesses belonging to each class of testimony, viz. to MSS., versions, the quotations of the fathers; to which have now been added critical canons of an internal nature. It remains for us to look at them together. We have to do with them conjointly, and not singly. The classes have not only a

separate but a relative value towards one another. Considering them *together*, it may be asked how they should be adjusted and disposed.

The first place belongs to ancient, uninterpolated, good, Greek copies. Their authority is paramount. From them chiefly should the text be derived. The nearer their testimony approaches to unanimity, the greater certainty belongs to it. And the authority of *ancient* MSS. is unquestionably superior to that of the modern, though the number of the latter is very much greater. Whoever undertakes to edit the Greek Testament should form his text *mainly* from the oldest and best MSS., disregarding the mass of cursive ones.

Where ancient MSS. are not unanimous in a reading, or the right text is doubtful, it is necessary to consult the earliest and most critical of the fathers; and when they expressly quote or comment upon a reading, or speak of its being in MSS. in their time, much weight attaches to their testimony. Greek fathers who belong to this class, such as Origen and Jerome who knew and used Greek copies, may be put on a level with the oldest and best MSS.

The testimony of ancient versions is valuable in doubtful cases, especially where the manifest goodness of the reading proves that the variety has not been caused by a blunder of the translator. What versions are most useful in shewing is, the insertion or omission of members of sentences and important words.

Next to versions in point of value come the bare and casual quotations of the fathers, or the express and unquestionable quotations of those who are later than the fifth century. It is not often that the true reading cannot be determined by means of the ancient MSS., aided by versions and the quotations of the fathers. When the three sources are combined, they are usually sufficient to indicate pretty clearly the genuine text. Yet there are cases where other considerations

are desirable. Internal canons may be fairly applied, after some hesitation is felt in settling the text on the basis of external evidence. Indeed these critical rules should be taken *along with* the external testimonies. They should guide and influence judgments based on external documents. If it be thought they are not *necessary*, they are at least highly desirable.

With these general statements, we shall proceed to consider various cases of doubtful reading. Examples will be of more benefit than rules; for the latter can only be expressed in general terms. Minute limitations cannot be conveniently given, since they arise out of particular cases. In all doubtful instances, we are disposed to rely on the most ancient and best MSS., rejecting readings found *only* in modern copies, weighing the congruities or incongruities of such as are supported by *the most important* testimony, and deciding accordingly. We do not affirm that the *most ancient* MSS. may not contain an incorrect reading. Doubtless they agree in various false ones. But versions, quotations, and internal congruity will serve to point out the mistakes in question.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF PASSAGES.

HAVING described the various sources whence criticism derives a correct text, we shall now allude to the most remarkable passages in the New Testament whose authenticity has been disputed. There are several such places, about which critics have entertained conflicting opinions. By discussing these, the mode in which the sources already described may be applied will be seen, and the way in which their comparative merits should be adjusted. When one is put in possession of all the evidence, he will be able to judge himself of those portions, without the uncertainty of having to rely on the reports of others.

1 *Timothy* iii. 16.

Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, επιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

"And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

This passage has given rise to much discussion. There are three different readings of it, which are supposed materially to affect the sense.

1. One reading is, ὃς ἐφανερώθη.

2. A second is, ὃ ἐφανερώθη.

3. The common reading is, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη.

Let us consider the evidence in favour of each—

1. This is supported by A. *a prima manu*, by C. *a prima manu*, F. G. 17, 73, 181.

A. The controversy respecting the original reading of this MS. is now settled. It is matter of history. It has been ascertained beyond a doubt that it must have had ος at first. The present reading indeed is Θ̄C or θεός, but the two transverse lines, one in ο, making it ⊙ or Theta, the other above, marking a contraction, proceeded from another hand than the original transcriber. The line above is thick and clumsy compared with the slenderer and more graceful strokes made by the copyist; the same is the case with the transverse stroke in ο. Both too differ in the colour of the ink from the rest of the word. But Young, Wotton, Mill, Croyk, Berriman, Woide, Grabe, who saw the MS. when it was less worn and faded than it is now, believed that its original reading was θεός. On the other hand, Wetstein, Hempelius, Porson, Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and many who have carefully examined it in recent times, believe that it had ὃς at first. We think that the more intently it is looked at with the naked eye and with powerful glasses by such as are skilled in matters of the kind, the conclusion will appear the more clear that its real reading was ὃς.

C. or Cod. *Ephraemi.*

The original reading of this MS. was also formerly disputed. Woide, Weber, and Parquoi, were in favour of θεός; Wetstein and Griesbach of ὃς. The arguments of Griesbach are valid and convincing.* If anything was wanting in them to prove that ος was the first writing, it was supplied by Tischendorf, who has had most to do with C. He has

* Symbolae Criticae, vol. i. pp. 8-28.

shewn very clearly that both the middle line of O and the line above ΘC are so drawn and have such an appearance as to betray a later hand than the first. Both lines were made by the second corrector.* Tregelles coincides with Tischendorf in believing that OC was the primitive reading.

In regard to G. or the *codex Boernerianus*, it certainly reads ὃς not ὅ. Nor is there the least trace in its text of any other reading than OC, as any one may see by consulting Matthaei's edition of it, which has a fac-simile of this very passage.

As to F. *Cod. Augiensis*, it is not a transcript of G. as has sometimes been stated. The idea of resolving its testimony into that of G. because it has OC after G. altered, is absurd. G. has not been changed from O to OC; and F. is not a copy of G.

These observations will shew that Griesbach rightly quoted G. and F. as supporting the reading OC.

It is in the Gothic version. The later Syriac in the margin, the Memphitic, and Sahidic seem also to have had it. But attempts have been made to explain away the evidence of the margin of the Philoxenian, the Memphitic and Sahidic versions. Thus Henderson asserts,† that the marginal ܐܣ in the later Syriac was only intended more definitely to mark ܐܠܗܐ, *God* as the immediate antecedent to the verb, and quotes various passages in the version where ܐܣ ܐܠܗܐ occurs, *God who*. But this is not apposite. Whenever a marginal (not a textual) ܐܣ can be quoted in favour of this position, we shall consider the matter; but till then we must abide by the plain fact that ܐܣ was meant to stand as another reading for the one in the text.

In opposition to the testimony of the Memphitic and Sahidic for ὃς, Laurence simply *asserts* that "they more probably use

* Prolegomena in Cod. Ephrem. Rescript. p. 39, et seq.

† In the American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 34.

a relative connected with an antecedent expressive of the word *mystery*, in precise conformity with the Vulgate, for in both the Coptic and Sahidic the word *mystery* is decidedly proved to be *masculine* by the definitive article masculine in one case, and the prefix in the other, so that the subsequent relative occurs of course in the same gender." After this the learned archbishop proceeds,—"Having thus *proved* that the Coptic, the Sahidic, &c. do not necessarily read ὅς but most probably ὅ, &c. &c."* This is a curious way of *proving* a thing, by simply *asserting* the thing *to be proved.* In fact, not the slightest particle of proof is offered for ὅ in preference to ὅς. It is *possible* that the two versions in question read ὅ, but we believe it far more likely that they had the masculine ὅς. The relative pronoun in both is *masculine;* and though the antecedent representing the word *mystery* be masculine also, yet that is rather in favour of ὅς than ὅ, because a word might be chosen for *mystery* of *the masculine* gender on purpose to have it agree in gender with the relative pronoun.

Among the fathers, it is supported by Cyril of Alexandria who writes thus:—πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς· μήτε μὴν τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, τουτέστιν Χριστὸν ὃς ἐφανερώθη, κ. τ. λ.

And a little after: εἴη γὰρ ἂν οὐχ' ἕτερον οἶμαι τί τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, ἢ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ὃς ἐφανερώθη, κ. τ. λ.†

"Ye err not knowing the Scriptures, nor indeed the great mystery of godliness that is Christ who was manifested in the flesh," &c.

"For I think the mystery of godliness can be nothing else than our very Logos himself, who proceeded from God the Father, who was manifested," &c.

This passage appears to us to favour ὅς rather than ὅ. It shews very clearly that Cyril did not read θεός.

* Remarks on Griesbach's classification of MSS. pp. 78, 79.

† Opera, ed. Aubert, vol. v. part ii. p. 6, §§ 7, 8.

In like manner the same father reads ὅς in his explanation of the second Anathematism. It is true that Aubert, the editor of his works, has in that place θεὸς; but it has been clearly shewn by Wetstein and Griesbach that ὅς is the true reading, because it is found in the MSS. of Cyril and in catenae.

In his first oration on the orthodox faith, the same father writes: καὶ ὁμολογουμένως, κ. τ. λ. θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ. Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς; ἢ δῆλον ὅτι πάντη τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρος λόγος, κ. τ. λ. And immediately after: καὶ οὔτε που φάμεν; ὅτι καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἁπλῶς, ἀλλ' ὡς θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ, καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς γεγονώς.*

"And confessedly, &c. God was manifested in the flesh. Who was it that was manifested in the flesh? Is it not obvious that it was he who is absolutely and entirely the Word proceeding from God the Father? &c. We do not say that he was simply a man as we are, but as if God in the flesh, and born like us."

Here again Cyril has been altered, for the very context proves that he did not read θεὸς but ὅς. Aubert has followed interpolated MSS. in this case also, as Griesbach has shewn.†

Henceforth let not the advocates of θεὸς adduce Cyril in their favour; for it is clear that he is against that reading. He may be quoted for ὅς. Printed editions of his works *do* exhibit θεὸς; but from MSS. and other sources we conclude that his language has been altered. If he read θεὸς, why did he not appeal to 1 Timothy iii. 16 against the emperor Julian who denied that Jesus was ever called *God* by Paul? He could not have overlooked a reading so much to his purpose. Yet he never adduces θεὸς from this passage against Julian. Nor does he appeal to it against Nestorius, which we must believe he would have done had he read it, for it must have been very effective against his great adversary.

* Opera, ed. Aubert, vol. v. part ii. p. 124.

† Symbolae Criticae, vol. i. p. 52

And if θεὸς were the original reading, how comes it that it was not quoted by the fathers against the Arians, after the commencement of the Arian controversy. It cannot be shewn that Athanasius himself ever cited it, though it be so apposite.

It is probable that Clement of Alexandria also read ὅς. We find the following from him in Œcumenius: ὦ μυστήριον· μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸν Χριστόν. "O the mystery. The angels saw Christ with us." The context of this passage clearly shews that Clement could not have had θεός. He probably read ὅς, like the other Alexandrine fathers. It is true that the words quoted do not *exactly determine* whether he read ὅς or ὅ; but they *favour* the former. And yet they have been quoted to shew that Clement *clearly* read the text with the neuter relative!

Origen has Ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἐμὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐν δόξῃ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι λέγηται.*

"If my *Jesus* is said to have been taken up to glory."

In another work, the same writer is made to say in the Latin version by Rufinus—"Is qui verbum caro factus apparuit positus in carne, sicut apostolus dicit, quia manifestatus est carne, justificatus, etc."†

"He who became flesh as the Word appeared in the flesh, as the apostle says—'he who was manifested in the flesh (reading qui for quia), &c. &c.'"

There can be little doubt that this passage favours the reading ὅς.

An excerpt in Latin from a work of Theodore of Mopsuestia is given in the Acts of the council of Constantinople, where the reading ὅς is found. Jerome on Isaiah liii. 11 also supports it. Pseudo-Chrysostom has also been cited for the same.‡

* Contra Cels. Lib. iii. sect. 31, Opp. vol. i. Benedictine edition, p. 467.

† Comment. in epist. ad Roman. cap. i. 2.

‡ In a treatise printed in the Benedictine edition of Chrysostom, vol. x. p. 764.

Gelasius of Cyzicus, in the Acts of the council of Nice, may also be quoted for the same. Epiphanius has it twice. In like manner it is highly probable that Chrysostom read ὅς, though all printed editions of his works make him read θεός. Editors have tampered with his text; as was not uncommon. He has suffered greatly in his citations from Scripture; his homilies being so often transcribed. In any case it can be shewn that Chrysostom did not read θεὸς as he is made to do in the printed editions of his works. No reliance can be placed on the *cited words of the text*, as that text interspersed among his commentaries, was continually modernised by copyists. Thus while we read in Montfaucon's edition of his works* . . . . εἰς ἕτερον ἀνάγει τὸ ῥᾶγμα, λέγων, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ τουτέστιν ὁ δημιουργὸς ὤφθη, φησίν, ἐν σαρκί; the same passage stands in Cramer's catena:† εἰς ἕτερον ἀνάγει τὸ ῥᾶγμα· ὅτι "ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί," δημιουργὸς ὤν· ὄντως μέγα τὸ μυστήριον, παντα χοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἠκούσθη καὶ ἐπιστεύθη τοῦτο· μὴ γὰρ νομίσῃς ἁπλῶς ῥήματα εἶναι ψιλὰ, ὤφθη φησὶν ἐν σαρκί. Here θεὸς has grown out of ὅτι. Henceforth therefore Chrysostom should not be cited for θεός. And if he did not read thus, he must have had ὅς or ὅ, probably the former.

It would also appear that Liberatus, Victor, and Hincmar had MSS. which read ὅς; or at least they regarded θεὸς as a late reading, since they affirm that Macedonius of Constantinople, who lived under the emperor Anastasius at the beginning of the sixth century, changed ὅς into θεός.

A good deal has been written respecting the statements of these witnesses against Macedonius. And it must be confessed that their testimony is of little value, though Sir Isaac Newton laid great stress upon it. Considerations have been adduced which go far to shew the improbable circumstances mixed up with the story. Macedonius doubtless preferred θεὸς

* Vol. xi. p. 606. † Page 31.

as the reading, and may have attempted to alter ὅς into θεὸς in some copies; but it is very unlikely that he was deposed and expelled from Constantinople for the alteration in question. It is not likely that the story is *wholly* baseless; but that it is largely fictitious we fully believe. All that can be safely inferred from it is, that the witnesses in question reckoned ὅς a prior reading to θεὸς; and that they may have had it in documents before them.

The following have also been thought to favour ὅς, though several of them might equally perhaps apply to ὅ.

Barnabas writes, Ἴδε, πάλιν Ἰησοῦς οὐχ' ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τύπῳ καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς.*

The epistle to Diognetus usually printed with Justin's works, has ἀπέστειλε λόγον ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ, ὃς ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀτιμασθείς, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθείς, ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη.†

Gregory of Nyssa says, τὸ μυστήριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐφανερώθη· καλῶς τοῦτο λέγων· οὗτος ὁ ἡμέτερος λόγος.‡

Basil writes, τοῦ μεγάλου μυστηρίου ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. καὶ ἀθετοῦντας τοῦ μεγάλου μυστηρίου τὴν χάριν τοῦ σεσιγημένου μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, φανερωθέντος δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίοις· ὅτε ὁ κύριος, κ. τ. λ. ——————αὐτὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.§

Both these last testimonies certainly favour ὅς.

Didymus: "Secundum quod dictum est: manifestatur in carne."‖

Theodotus: ὁ σωτὴρ ὤφθη κατιὼν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις διοτι καὶ εὐηγγελίσαντο αὐτόν.¶

Nestorius: τὸ ἐν τῇ Μαρίᾳ γεννηθέν . . . . ἐφανερώθη γάρ, φησίν, ἐν σαρκὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι.**

* Epistola, cap. xii. † Page 501, ed. Colon. 1686.
‡ Antirrhet. advers. Apollinar. p. 138.
§ Opp. Benedictine edition, vol. iii. p. 401, epist. 261. ‖ In 1 Joann. 4.
¶ Epitom. xviii. vol. ii. p. 973, in Clement's works by Potter.
** Ap. Arnob. junior.

2. ὅ is supported by the following documents and authorities :—

It is in D. *a prima manu.*

It is also in the old Latin and the Vulgate. The old Syriac may have had ὅς as well as ὅ, since the relative ? *Dolath* applies equally to the masculine and neuter genders. The Syriac noun for μυστήριον is masculine, and therefore *Dolath* may be considered masculine in this place ; but that does not help us, since the Syriac noun means nothing else than *mystery.* On the whole it is impossible to decide whether it had ὅς or ὅ. Henderson's reasoning to shew that it may have had θεὸς equally well as ὅ, is a piece of special pleading undeserving of notice ;* and the attempt of Laurence to shew that ὅ *not* ὅς is favoured by the version, proves a failure.† To say that μυστήριον, or its Syriac representative, is the antecedent to the Syriac relative Dolath, is saying nothing at all in favour of the neuter more than the masculine, especially as the Syriac representative of μυστήριον is *masculine*, which the translator may have understood of *a person.*

In like manner the Arabic of Erpenius may favour either ὅ or ὅς. The same remarks apply to it as to the Syriac version. The observations of Henderson to shew that its reading is consistent with θεὸς are as far-fetched as they are in relation to the Peshito. It by no means holds good that if the translator had intended to say the *mystery* was manifested, he would have used the pronoun الذي not ان, because along with the latter is here the pronominal suffix referring to the Arabic representative of μυστήριον. On the other hand, the Arabic reading of this version applies indifferently to ὅς and ὅ.

The pronoun in the Ethiopic is equally ambiguous, and therefore we cannot from it determine in favour either of ὅ or ὅς. Thus Griesbach rightly says, that these three versions

* See American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 19.

† Remarks on Griesbach's classification of MSS. pp. 79, 80.

support either ὃς or ὅ, it being impossible to decide for the masculine or neuter relative from the nature of the words employed in these versions. When Laurence undertakes to shew that they "do not indifferently read ὃς or ὅ, but indisputably ὅ," he undertakes too much. The following is his proof:—

"If ὃς be the reading, it is evident that the following clauses of the verse *cannot* be grammatically connected *by a copulative*, but that the passage must be translated as the Unitarians translate it, '*He*, who was manifested in the flesh, *was justified*,' &c. But in all the versions alluded to the subsequent clauses *are* grammatically connected *by a copulative*, ... that is, by the same letter *wau* in the different characters of the different languages expressive of the same conjunction *and;* so that the passage must unavoidably be rendered, 'which was manifested in the flesh, *and* was justified in the Spirit,'"* &c.

If this be the "indisputable shewing" of these versions having ὅ not ὃς, it amounts to no shewing at all. It is wholly baseless, proceeding on *the assumption* that the following clauses of the verse *cannot* be grammatically connected *by a copulative* while ὃς is the reading; and that the rendering *he who* is incompatible with the use of these copulatives. Now, we hold that the rendering of ὃς *he who*, is *not* incompatible with the use of the copulatives in the clauses that follow. What more natural, for example, than the translation, "He who was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, was seen of angels, was preached unto the Gentiles, was believed on in the world, was received up into glory;" the whole being one emphatic explanation of *the mystery of godliness?* In this view, which is good Greek and good sense, the copulatives inserted alter nothing. They merely dilute the emphasis a little. Hence the copulatives, which perform so important an

* Remarks, &c. pp. 79, 80.

office in Laurence's opinion, may be safely left out of view as of no consequence whatever.

The Armenian is as doubtful as the three versions just alluded to. According to Henderson, "Dr. Laurence maintains that the Armenian version reads neither ὅς nor ὅ, but θεός." * But this is incorrect, and unjust to Laurence. After referring to two editions before him, Laurence proceeds to say, "In both of these, the following is the literal rendering of the passage in question :—" *Great is the deep counsel of the adoration of God, who* or *which*," &c. Now if we connect the relative with the antecedent *God*, the reading will of course be equivalent to the common one θεός. But as there are no genders in the language, it may be connected with any antecedent indifferently. And it should be added that the phrase *adoration of God* may be nothing more than a mere compound expression, similar (would our own language admit the combination) to that of God-worship, and may thus simply correspond with εὐσεβείας." † Thus Laurence holds the same opinion respecting the Armenian as Dr. Henderson himself, viz., that its testimony is doubtful.

All the Latin fathers have *mysterium* or *sacramentum quod* manifestatum, &c., even though they understood it of Christ. Hilary, Augustine, Pelagius, Julian, Fulgentius, Idacius, Ambrosiaster (Hilary the deacon), Leo the Great, Victorinus, Cassian, Gregory the Great, Bede, Chrysologus, Martin the first, &c. Indeed all the Latin fathers except Jerome and Epiphanius the deacon are in favour of ὅ the neuter.

3. θεὸς is supported by D. *a tertia manu* J. K. and almost all the cursive MSS.

It is also in the Arabic of the Polyglott and the Slavonic version. In favour of it we also have Didymus (De Trinitate) but on 1 John 4, he rather favours ὅς, as we have already

* See American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 20.

† Remarks, &c. pp. 80, 81.

seen; Dionysius of Alexandria, Theodoret, Euthalius, Macedonius, John of Damascus, Theophylact, Œcumenius. Of the Latin fathers, Epiphanius the deacon (in the eighth century) is the only one who has *Deus*. Chrysostom should no longer be quoted out of the printed editions as favourable to this reading; for there is little doubt that he had ὅς.

The only ones of these witnesses who can be said to have much weight are Theodoret and Dionysius. The former comments thus on the passage: μυστήριον δὲ αὐτὸ κάλει, ὡς ἄνωθεν μὲν προορισθέν. (Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί). θεὸς γὰρ ὢν, καὶ θεοῦ υἱὸς, καὶ ἀόρατος ἔχων τὴν φύσιν, ὅλος ἄπασιν ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐγένετο. Σαφῶς δὲ ἡμᾶς τὰς δύο φύσεις ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὴν θείαν ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν.*

"He calls it a mystery as having been foreordained from the beginning. God was manifested in the flesh. For being God and the Son of God, and having an invisible nature, he became manifest to all by being incarnate. Thus he has clearly taught us the two natures, for he said that the divine nature was manifested in the flesh."

Dionysius of Alexandria thus writes: Εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ συναΐδιος λόγος· ἓν αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον, ἀόρατος θεὸς, καὶ ὁρατὸς γενόμενος· Θεὸς γὰρ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.† "Christ is one, the co-eternal Logos who is in the Father. There is one person of him who is the invisible God, and who became visible; for God was manifested in the flesh."

Though we cannot say that Dionysius here cites the words of 1 Timothy iii. 16 expressly, yet it is probable that he had in his mind the passage before us. But it is doubtful whether he has been rightly edited. His language seems to have been tampered with, for the sake of the Vulgate.

This is quite probable, when we consider that none of the Alexandrine fathers read θεός. They either are silent respect-

* In ep. 1, ad Timoth. vol. iii. p. 478, ed. Paris, 1642.

† Epist. advers. Paul Samosat.

ing the passage, which in this case is almost equivalent to their not reading θεὸς, inasmuch as it was so opportune against the Arians, Nestorians, and others; or they shew their preference for ὅς. Cyril, Clement, Origen, Athanasius, &c. could not have had θεός. And we must believe that Dionysius was not singular among the Alexandrine fathers. He favoured the Alexandrine reading, which is undoubtedly ὅς.

No importance can be attached to Didymus a blind man, who reads θεὸς in his work on the Trinity, but seems to prefer ὅς in another place, viz. "Secundum quod dictum est: manifestatur in carne" (1 John 4). As the Alexandrines did not know θεὸς, it is natural to suppose that Didymus formed no exception. We do not therefore put him among the witnesses for it, believing that he has suffered from meddling transcribers or correctors. Nor can any weight be assigned to the testimony of Euthalius in favour of θεὸς, though one should think so from the manner in which Henderson brings it forward. Euthalius, says he, "reads in like manner θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκι, 'God manifest in the flesh;' *and* entitles the chapter or division in which the words occur, περὶ θείας σαρκώσεως, 'of the *divine* incarnation.'" * One would naturally conclude from these words, that Euthalius had expressly quoted the passage with θεὸς; whereas he merely gives the heading of the section in which it occurs, the title περὶ θείας σαρκώσεως, *of the divine incarnation;* which he might equally do if ὅς or ὅ had been the reading; since the fathers often applied *the mystery* (μυστήριον) *to the person of Christ.* Thus Euthalius's testimony ceases to be explicit or valuable. It is a mere inference, and that an uncertain one, that he found θεὸς in the Greek text.

The authority of Macedonius can hardly be pleaded in favour of θεὸς; because Hincmar, Victor, and Liberatus said that he had corrupted the text or changed ὅς into θεός. *If*

* American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 39.

Macedonius *did actually alter* ὅς into θεὸς in some copies, we cannot tell that he made the change after Greek MSS. He may not have followed them at all. But indeed the story wants a good foundation.

As to Damascenus, Theophylact, and Œcumenius, they are all too late to be of much value.

Other writers are quoted for θεός. Thus Ignatius in his epistle to the Ephesians writes: Εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός.*

When writing thus Ignatius *may* or *may not* have had 1 Timothy iii. 16 in his mind; but it is neither proved nor implied that he took the words from the passage with θεός. He could have employed such phraseology without having read 1 Timothy iii. 16 in any shape. The same remarks will apply to another place in his epistle which has likewise been cited on this subject: Πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν . . . . . παλαιὰ βασιλεία διεφθείρετο, θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου. Here too the Syriac recension has υἱοῦ for θεοῦ.†

Hippolytus is also cited in support of the same reading: Οὗτος προελθὼν εἰς κόσμον θεὸς ἐν σώματι ἐφανερώθη.‡

This is not a *quotation* of 1 Timothy iii. 16. It is perhaps a free reference to it, from which nothing can be inferred in favour of the reading θεός.

The following have also been quoted from Athanasius:— φοβεῖσθαι τὴν περὶ τοῦ τηλικούτου μυστηρίου ζήτησιν, ὁμολογεῖν δὲ ὅτι πεφανέρωται θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀποστολίκην παράδοσιν.

But this occurs in the tract *De Incarnatione verbi Dei*, which is now universally rejected as Athanasius's.

Another passage is: Ἔχουσι γὰρ ἀπόστολον συγγνώμον αὐτοῖς νέμοντα, καὶ οἱονεὶ χεῖρα αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἐκτείνοντα, ὅτι καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.§

But most MSS. omit this passage. In one MS. it is in

* Cap. 7. † Cap. 19. ‡ Advers. Noet. cap. 17. § Epist. 4 ad Serap.

the margin, not in the text. Hence it must be regarded as the gloss of some other person, and not Athanasius's own. Henderson has suppressed the fact that most MSS. of Athanasius omit this passage.

Gregory Nyssene is cited in favour of θεός. Thus he writes: πεισθέντες ὅτί ἀληθῶς θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐκεῖνο μόνον ἀληθινὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον εἶναι, κ. τ. λ..

Again: πάντες οἱ τὸν λόγον κηρύσσοντες ἐν τούτῳ τὸ θαῦμα τοῦ μυστηρίου καταμηνύουσιν· ὅτι θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, ὅτι ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.

Again: Τιμοθέῳ δὲ διαῤῥήδην βοᾷ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. *

These passages are explicit in shewing that Gregory had θεὸς, provided the printed copies of his works can be relied on. But no reliance can be placed on these; especially as elsewhere he read differently, probably ὅς, or as others suppose, ὅ.

The apostolic constitutions are also cited on the same side: θεὸς κύριος ὁ ἐπιφανεὶς ἡμῖν ἐν σαρκί. †

Here there is no citation, nor do the words at all justify the inference that 1 Timothy iii. 16 had θεός.

Gregory Thaumaturgus is also cited here, or rather Apollinaris in Photius: θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς. If this be derived from 1 Timothy iii. 16, no reliance can be placed on it, as it is given by Photius of Constantinople in the tenth century, who had probably no other reading in the text than that of the received text which is contained in all the Constantinopolitan copies.

Let us now review the external evidence in favour of the three forms of our present text.

Ὅς is supported by A. or the codex Alexandrinus; by C. or the cod. Ephremi; by F. or the cod. Augiensis; and by G. or the cod. Boernerianus. Thus two of the most ancient

* Orat. x. contra Eunom. Opp. vol. ii. p. 265, ed. Paris 1615. † vii. 26.

and valuable MSS., both belonging to the fifth century, have this reading; while G. of the ninth century, a valuable MS. of that age, is on the same side; and F. too, contemporary with G. Indeed F. and G. were both taken from an older codex.

Ὃ is supported by D. or the Clermont MS., an ancient and valuable document belonging to the end of the sixth century.

Θεὸς is supported by a corrector of D. or the Clermont MS., who could scarcely have been older than the eighth century; by J. a MS. of the ninth century; and by K. of the same age. It has also almost all the cursive or later MSS. in its favour.

There can be no question that ὅς is *best attested by ancient and valuable MS. authority;* while ὅ has but *one* uncial MS. in its favour. Hence on the ground of MS. evidence we should adopt the former reading. When Dr. J. P. Smith writes, "if we regard the authority of MSS. alone, in every mode of estimating that branch of the evidence, and upon every system of families, recensions, or classes, he is quite satisfied that the reading GOD should be decisively preferred,"* he evinces a most strange inclination for *number* in MSS., neglecting their *antiquity;* for it is only by *counting* not *weighing* authorities that any one could prefer θεὸς to ὅς. But indeed every critic who knows that ὅς has the uncial codices A. C. F. G. in its favour, and that θεὸς is supported only by D*** J. and K. of the uncials, will not hesitate for a moment to disregard the crowd of cursive MSS. as well as D*** J. and K. by the side of A. C. F. and G. which take us up to *the fifth* century.

With respect to versions—Ὃς has in its favour the Gothic, margin of the Philoxenian, and in all probability the Memphitic and Sahidic.

* The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, vol. ii. p. 384, fourth edition.

Ὅ is supported by the old Latin and the Vulgate.

Θεὸς, on the other hand, is supported by the Arabic of the Polyglott and the Slavonic version.

Here the evidence of versions is rather in favour of ὅς. Still the preponderance in this respect of ὅς over ὅ is small; since the old Latin is of great weight. But *number* is sufficient to outweigh every other consideration.

With respect to the *fathers*, their testimony is contradictory and uncertain, as we have already seen.

Ὅς is supported by Epiphanius, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Jerome; *with certainty* by Epiphanius and Jerome; *in all probability* by Cyril and Chrysostom.

Ὅ is supported by almost all the Latin fathers except Jerome. It does not clearly occur in any of the Greek fathers.

Θεὸς is clearly favoured by Theodoret, Damascene, Œcumenius, and Theophylact. Here again ὅς is best supported. It is manifestly sustained by more ancient authorities than θεὸς; and as to ὅ, the evidence of the Latin fathers cannot be regarded as independent of the Latin version. They used and quoted the *versio vetus*, and afterwards the revised copy of it made by Jerome. Hence they are witnesses for the Greek text only *through* the Latin translation.

In this manner we arrive at the conclusion that ὅς is best supported by the external evidence in its threefold division of MSS., versions, and fathers.

We come now to *internal* evidence.

Ὅς is the most difficult reading. It appears harsh and ungrammatical. Hence it would be most readily altered. Again, the origin of the other two can be better explained from it than its rise from either of them. It is easy to see how prone copyists would be to change ὅς into ὅ in order to make it agree in gender with the antecedent μυστήριον. They knew also that the passage was commonly explained of

Christ; and as most MSS. were in the hands of the orthodox, they might change ΟC into Θ̄C̄. In this manner it would be a better weapon against such heretics as impugned the proper deity of Christ. Certainly the tendency in early times would be to change, by a slight process, ὅς into θεός. Little suspicion would attach to the person or persons who did so, amid the anxiety to uphold the divinity of Christ's person. The altered reading would be generally welcomed and adopted. And, improbable, as we naturally reckon it to be that mention should have been made of ὅς being changed into θεός, since the writings of those likely to speak of it are so few, yet mention *is* made of it in the case of Macedonius. Whatever truth there be in that account, one thing at least is certain, that some persons about or soon after the time of Macedonius, regarded the reading ὅς as the original out of which arose θεός.

On the other hand, had θεὸς been early changed into ὅς, we should most probably have heard of it in history. The orthodox must have noticed the alteration, and would doubtless have reprobated it. They would at once have detected and exposed it as a corruption of the text made to impugn a great doctrine for which they contended so strenuously. Yet we do not read in any ancient writer of the text having been corrupted from θεὸς into ὅς. Hence it may be inferred that it was *not* so changed. The origin of ὅς is not accounted for by the fathers in that way—a way in which it was most natural for them to explain it had they not felt that it was the true reading.

If it be said that ὅς may have arisen by accident or the carelessness of transcribers from θεὸς, we answer, that even then it would soon have been noticed and restored. An *accidental* alteration would soon have been converted by the fathers into a *designed* one on the part of heretics, had ὅς become as extensively diffused as we judge from A. and C. that it really was.

But various objections have been made to ὃς.

It does not accord with the laws of grammatical construction. This has been often asserted but never proved. It is not necessary to refer ὅς to μυστήριον as its simple and sole antecedent. Neither is it necessary to refer it to θεοῦ ζῶντος with a parenthesis between. We do not adopt either of those constructions; and therefore all considerations based on them, and tending to shew that ὅς is neither good sense nor good Greek, may be left for those whom they concern.

We are disposed to understand ὅς in the sense of *he who*. To this construction too a common objection has been made, that it is foreign to the Greek idiom both classical and Hellenistic. It is said, for example, that the regular Greek construction would require ὁ φανερωθείς. The participle with the article prefixed is affirmed to be proper, as in the epistle to the Galatians i. 23, ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς, κ. τ. λ. *he that persecuted us*. In opposition to this argumentation we hold, that ὅς, in the sense of *he who*, is good Greek. It includes in itself both the demonstrative and relative. But it has been said, that where there is such an usage of ὅς as that before us, in the nominative, it is not used in the sense of *he who*, but *whosoever*, i.e. it is not employed *particularly* or *specifically*, but *generically*. It must be equivalent to ὅς ἐὰν or ὅς ἄν. In answer to this, we believe that the usage of ὅς in this way may be rendered sufficiently specific by the preceding context. So John iii. 34, Luke vii. 43, and other places. We cannot see therefore any valid objection to the rendering *he who*. It is good Greek, good sense, and has no internal consideration against it. But it should be remarked that we do not take the clauses *was justified in the Spirit*, &c. &c. as making up the predicate of the preposition of which ὅς is the subject; but *all* the clauses, including ὅς ἐφανερώθη, as an explanatory and emphatic adjunct to the *mystery of godliness*. It is intended to point out *in what* the mystery of godliness consists, shewing that it is concentrated and embodied in THE PERSON WHO *was manifested in the flesh, justified in the*

spirit, seen of angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. The proper antecedent or subject to which ὃς ἐφανερώθη refers is *implied* in μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας preceding.*

In favour of ὅ the neuter, it is said to be the more obscure reading. We believe this to be incorrect. Ὅς is the obscurest reading of the three. How could ὅ be the obscurest reading, when the fathers generally interpreted τὸ μυστήριον of the person of Christ? The fathers did not find the neuter difficult, else they would have altered it. They found ὃς much more obscure; and therefore they changed it into θεὸς or ὅ.

In favour of ὅ it is likewise alleged, that this reading overran all the versions used by the churches of Christ in the east and west—an extravagant and incorrect assertion, as is abundantly evident from what has been already advanced.

Against ὅ, internal evidence has been urged. It is asked, How could a mystery be manifested in the flesh, or justified in the spirit, or received up into glory? In answer to this we might urge the interpretation assigned by the fathers to μυστήριον, viz. *the person of Christ.* But here again we are told, that the fathers were wrong in understanding μυστήριον as *a designation of Christ*, because the usage of the term, wherever it occurs in the New Testament, is adverse. *The mystery of godliness* must mean, it is said, *some mysterious doctrine relating to Christ*; but cannot designate Christ himself as the mysterious person. There may be *some* force in this objection; but there cannot be much. The person of Christ was itself a mystery; and we should not therefore object to the interpretation of μυστήριον given by the fathers. And we should the less object to it, if it were true, as has been said, that Porson agreed with them in interpreting it as a designation of Christ's

* See Winer's *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Spracidioms*, p. 527, fourth edition; De Wette's *Exegetisches Handbuch* on 1 Timothy iii. 16; and Huther in *Meyer's Kommentar*, Abtheilung xi. p. 135.

person. But there is not a particle of evidence that Porson did so. *Kidd*, who collected and arranged Porson's tracts, says, "De sensu parum aut nihil refert; cum personam circumlocutione significant Graeci, quam citissime ad ipsam personam revertuntur. Ὅς non τὸ ἐητὸν, sed τὸ σημαινόμενον respicit."* These are not *Porson's* words or sentiments.

In favour of θεὸς we can see no internal evidence; for it is manifest that it arose from ὅς, not *vice versa*.

Against it, we may adduce the absence of the article before θεὸς, which should be in the subject of a proposition like the present. We should certainly expect it in this place. Professor Stuart found two hundred and fifty-seven cases, in which the article is prefixed to θεὸς when it is the subject of a proposition. On the other hand, he noticed four instances of exception to that prevailing usage, viz. 2 Corinth. v. 19; Gal. ii. 6, iii. 7; 1 Thes. ii. 5.†

It is also against θεὸς, that some at least of the expressions in the passage do not agree well with it. This is especially the case with ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις.

In adopting ὅς as the true reading, we are countenanced by the best critics such as Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Huther.

On the other hand ὅ is approved by Grotius, Sir Isaac Newton, Wetstein, Norton.

The common reading is sanctioned by Mill, Bengel, Matthaei, Rinck, and many others.

In closing this dissertation, we believe a fair case to be made out, as far as the present state of evidence warrants, in favour of ὅς. But the general sense is not materially different, whether we read ὅς, ὅ, or θεός. The meaning is much the same, whichever be adopted. Hence we cannot enter into the reasons of such as believe the text to be very important in a

* Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms of the late R. Porson, by Kidd, p. 291.

† American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 76.

theological view. It is by no means decisive either for or against the proper divinity of Christ. Too much stress has been laid upon it, in doctrinal controversies respecting the person of the Redeemer. We fully agree with Mr. Stuart in saying: "I cannot feel that the contest on the subject of the reading can profit one side so much, or harm the other so much, as disputants respecting the doctrine of the Trinity have supposed. Whoever attentively studies John xvii. 20-26; 1 John i. 3, ii. 5, iv. 15, 16, and other passages of the like tenor, will see that 'God might be manifest' in the person of Christ, without the necessary implication of the proper divinity of the Saviour; at least that the phraseology of Scripture does admit of other constructions besides this; and other ones moreover, which are not forced. And conceding this fact, less is determined by the contest about ὅς and θεὸς in 1 Timothy iii. 16, than might seem to be at first view."*

1 *John* v. 7.

This verse has been the subject of many controversies during the last three centuries—of controversies however which have proved of great benefit to biblical criticism, because various Greek MSS. and ancient versions have been examined with greater accuracy than they might otherwise have been.

In the received text the seventh and eighth verses stand thus:—ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες [ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Πατὴρ, ὁ Λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ] τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν.

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

* American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 79.

1. About 180 cursive MSS. containing the Catholic epistles have been examined. In addition to these there are in these epistles the uncial codices A. B. C. G. J. All these omit the passage except C. which is here imperfect. H. of the Acts is *not* uncial in regard to the Catholic epistles; for they are written in cursive characters by a later hand than the Acts. In short, no Greek MS. written before the fifteenth century has the disputed verse. Thus MS. evidence is decidedly against it.

In like manner the verse is wanting in all the ancient versions. It is not in the Vulgate, the old Syriac, and the Philoxenian versions. It is absent from the Memphitic and Sahidic. Nor is it found in the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Slavonic, the Arabic in Walton, and that published by Erpenius.

In modern *editions* of the Peshito it is sometimes found; but not in the genuine Syriac. Tremellius first translated it from Greek into Syriac, and placed it in the margin, whence later editors took it into the text. In recent editions of the Slavonic it is also found; but not in the MSS. or older editions. The same may be said of the Armenian version.

But the Vulgate has the passage now. In the Clementine edition of the Vulgate it stands thus:—"Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo: Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus sanctus: et hi tres unum sunt. Et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra: Spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis: et hi tres unum sunt." And it is found in the majority of its MSS., especially after the eighth century. Yet it is absent from the oldest and the best, such as the codd. Amiatinus, Harleianus, Alcuin's copy. Even *all the modern* MSS. do not exhibit the verse; and those which have it express it in various forms, as the codd. Toletanus, Demidovianus, &c. Thus the last mentioned codex has "*Quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt. Et tres sunt qui*

testimonium dant in coelo, pater, verbum, et spiritus, et hi tres unum sunt; while cod. Tolet. *nearly* agrees with it. In both the eighth verse is put before the seventh, which is the more usual order in the older copies that have the passage. And with regard to the copies of the Latin Vulgate that have the text, it also deserves mention, that those prior to the ninth century do not exhibit it *a prima manu;* while in many it is found in the margin from a more recent hand. One noticed by Porson has the seventh verse both before and after the eighth; many omit after the three earthly witnesses, *et hi tres unum sunt;* while others add to the phrase et hi tres unum sunt, *in Christo Jesu.* Indeed the position and form of the passage fluctuate in the different Latin MSS. in a remarkable manner.

Thus the Vulgate may be fairly regarded as a witness against the passage, rather than for it. Were all the more recent MSS. of it, which form the great majority of existing ones, uniform in their testimony; did they exhibit the passage in the same manner and *a prima manu*, their value in favour of the authenticity would be greater; but as long as they are the junior copies, and present the strange diversities they do, the evidence they furnish cannot counterbalance the older copies which uniformly want the passage. The circumstance that the more ancient of those who have it give the heavenly *after* the earthly witnesses, is a strong presumption that the former arose by a mystical interpretation out of the latter.

The ancient Greek fathers have not quoted the place, even where we should naturally expect them to do so. In adducing arguments for the Trinity, or the divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit, we can scarcely conceive of their overlooking it; especially as their arguments are frequently puerile and inapposite. Clement, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Athanasius, Didymus, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Caesarius, Chrysostom, Proclus,

Alexander of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, the Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae, Andreas of Caesarea, Johannes Damascenus, Elias of Crete, German of Constantinople, Œcumenius, Theophylact, Euthymus Zygabenus, Nicetas, besides various Greek catenae, and the Greek scholia of various MSS. ignore it. Nor is it mentioned in the Acts of any council, oecumenical or provincial, held among the Greeks.

Neither is the passage cited by the Latin fathers when most to their purpose, and where it might have been looked for. Thus it is omitted by the author of the treatise *De baptizandis haereticis* in Cyprian's works, by Novatian, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer, Ambrose, Faustinus, Leo the Great, Jerome, Augustine, Eucherius, Facundus, Junilius, Hesychius, Bede, Gregory, Boethius, Philastrius, Paschasius, Arnobius junior, &c. &c.

The advocates of the authenticity have affirmed notwithstanding, that it is quoted by Cyprian, Tertullian, and others, but in this they can be successfully met in argument, as we shall see afterwards.

The best critical editions have left out the words as spurious. They are not in Erasmus's first two editions. They are wanting in those of Aldus, Gerbelius, Cephalaeus, Colinaeus, Mace, Harwood, Matthaei, Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others. Bowyer enclosed them in brackets, and Knapp in double brackets, indicating their spuriousness.

Luther did not insert them in the first edition of his German version, and refused to admit them into any subsequent edition. But he had not been long dead when the passage was foisted in, contrary to his express request in the preface to the last edition printed during his life. Some editions of the version which have it exhibit it in smaller letters; others enclose it in brackets; others present it without any distinction.

Such is the strong evidence that lies against the authenticity.

2. Let us now, in the second place, adduce the evidence which has been alleged in favour of the passage.

(1.) The following MSS. have been quoted for it:—

Codex 173. This is the only MS. that contains the words as they stand in the received text but *a secunda manu*, the emendation being as recent as the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and taken from the Vulgate, as Scholz himself says. This codex was accurately noted by Birch: "In cod. Neapolitano Regio textus hujus commatis, cum additamentis recenti charactere margine scriptis, sequenti modo reperitur," &c. The codex itself belongs to the eleventh century, while the marginal reading belongs, as we have said, to the sixteenth or seventeenth. There is no reason, therefore, for charging Scholz with inconsistency, as he has been both ignorantly and unjustly accused.

The passage is also in 34, *i.e.* the *codex Montfortii*, *Montfortianus*, or *Britannicus* (of Erasmus).

There it stands thus:—*ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πατὴρ, λόγος, Καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς, ἕν εἰσι· Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ, καὶ αἷμα· εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν· κ. τ. λ.* Here it will be seen that the words *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν* in the eighth verse are wanting, an omission peculiar to the modern copies of the Vulgate. Again, the omission of the article in naming each of the heavenly witnesses; the use of *ἐν τῇ γῇ* for *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*; the position of *ἅγιον* with respect to *πνεῦμα*, being after whereas it ought to precede the substantive, are remarkable. For these reasons Porson inferred that the passage was a bungling translation from the Latin—a statement which bishop Burgess tried in vain to disprove; for all that he said in opposition was turned aside by Crito Cantabrigiensis. Another indication of the Latin origin is *ὁ χριστός ἐστιν*

ἀληθεία, a palpable translation of *Christus est veritas ;* contrary to the usual Greek reading.

The age of the MS. too is modern. It probably belongs to the fifteenth century; not certainly to the eleventh, as Martin of Utrecht thought; nor to the thirteenth, as Dr. A. Clarke imagined. All the best critics, Michaelis, Griesbach, Porson, Marsh, Scholz, Tischendorf, Turton (Crito Cantabrigiensis) assign it either to the fifteenth or sixteenth century. It is now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin; and has been shewn by Porson to be *probably* the *codex Britannicus* of Erasmus.*

Another MS. containing the passage is the *codex Ottobonianus*, marked 162 by Scholz, and now in the Vatican 298. It is a Greek-Latin copy of the Acts, the Catholic and Pauline epistles, and is ascribed by Scholz to the fifteenth century, which is rather too early. Here the passage is in a form different from the usual one. It wants the article before the words Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; instead of ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ it has ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ; and for ἐν τῇ γῃ, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Scholz states that there are innumerable transpositions of words in the MS., but does *not* say that they are from the Latin. He affirms that *this* passage is translated from the Vulgate, of which indeed there can be little doubt. Hence its evidence is of no value.

The passage is also in the *codex Ravianus* at Berlin. But this is universally admitted to be a forgery made from the Greek text of the Complutensian and the third edition of Stephens.

Another MS., the *codex Guelpherbytanus* C. has it, but in the margin and from a more recent hand than the text. Doubtless the marginal passage was taken from a printed edition, not a MS. It is also found in another Wolfenbüttel MS. of the seventeenth century; but this testimony is of no value, for Knittel affirms that the codex contains the various readings of the Vulgate and Peshito versions, with those of the

* Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, 1790, 8vo.

Latin translations made by Erasmus, Vatablus, Castalio, and Beza.

(2.) It is said to have been in the old Latin version which formed the basis of the Vulgate. But no *MS.* of that version can be adduced in support of the statement. Yet the writings of the African fathers who used it are appealed to. But we shall see by and bye, that none of the African fathers in reality cite the passage; and therefore the argument goes for nothing. It is simply an error to say that the old Latin contained the passage.

Here Wiseman's argument is ingenious but unsound. He is right in thinking that there were two ancient recensions of the *versio vetus*, the Italian and the African; but errs in saying that the clause had been lost at an early period both from the Greek MSS. and the Italian. He is right in holding that the version originated in Africa; but wrong in holding that the African recension, *as far as we know it now in MS. copies*, is superior in authority to the Italian. Hence his conclusion "that the existence of an African recension containing the verse gives us a right to consider as quotations passages of African writers (such as those of Cyprian and Tertullian), which in the works of Italian authors may be considered doubtful," is fallacious, as is proved sufficiently by Augustine's writings, whence it is evident that he was ignorant of the passage though preferring and using Italian copies of the vetus.

It is but right, however, to add the *mode* in which the learned writer reasons. He gives a quotation from the ancient MS. preserved at the monastery of Santa Croce in Jerusalem, which contains, among other works, one terminating with the words *explicit liber testimoniorum*, and having in an earlier hand as a title *Libri de Speculo.* The work is nearly the same with that published by Vignier at Paris 1655, under the name of the *Speculum* of Augustine; but which was rejected as

spurious by the Benedictine editors of Augustine. The Santa Croce MS. differs from Vignier's publication in one particular, viz. its Scripture quotations are from the *versio vetus*, whereas in Vignier they are from Jerome's Vulgate. Hence Wiseman thinks that the MS. in question contains the genuine speculum of Augustine. In it the passage before us stands thus: "Item Johannis in aepistula. . . . . Item illic tres sunt qui testimonium dicunt in coelo, Pater, Verbum et Sp. s. et hii tres unum sunt."—(Cap. ii. fol. 19, de distinctione personarum.) In this manner Augustine is brought in as a witness for the verse along with Tertullian and Cyprian. The evidence of African writers is in favour of the verse having existed in the text or recension of that church, and consequently the MSS. which contained the verse possessed not a mere individual authority but one equal to that of the whole class to which they belonged.

The objection to all this is, that the acknowledged writings of Augustine shew no acquaintance on his part with the verse before us. This favours the suspicion that the *Speculum* contained in the Santa Croce MS. is *not* the work of Augustine. It is mere assumption in Wiseman to reply that "St. Augustine in his ordinary works used the Italian recension, from which the verse had been lost at an early period. The Speculum, as we learn from Possidius, was written for the unlearned, and hence he made use in it of the African recension which universally contained the verse." *

It is said to be in the Latin version called the Vulgate. But we have already seen that it is absent from the oldest and best copies of it. Hence it would be more correct to say that the Vulgate is a witness *against* the passage.

(3.) It is quoted by many Latin fathers. But it is remarkable that there is not the evidence of a single Italian father for the verse in question. Their writings shew their ignorance of

* See Catholic Magazine, vol. iii. p. 363.

it. Even when defending or proving the doctrine of the Trinity, they do not quote it; though they cite the neighbouring context relating to the earthly witnesses. The only evidence of this kind adduced for it is the African authority, which we proceed to consider. We need scarcely say that the authority of the Latin fathers is inferior to that of the Greek in determining the original text, because they commonly used a Latin version current among them; whereas the Greek used the Greek itself. And even if they do quote in express terms the passage before us, the fact would prove no more than that it was in their MS. or MSS. of whatever Latin version they used.

Tertullian has been brought forward as a witness for the verse. Thus in his treatise against Praxeas (chapter 25), he writes: "Cæterum de meo sumet, inquit, sicut ipse Patris. Ila connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohaerentes alterum ex altero: *qui tres unum sunt, non unus;* quomodo dictum est: Ego et Pater unum sumus, ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem." From the words *qui tres unum sunt* being now in the Vulgate, it has been thought that Tertullian found them in the old Latin. It is observable however, that he does not produce them as a quotation; and from what follows it is plain that he did not know of the verse, because, in proof of the assertion he immediately adds, *quomodo dictum est ego et pater unum sumus*, which is a quotation from John's gospel x. 30. If he had been acquainted with a text asserting the unity of the three persons, he would surely have appealed to it, instead of to one that relates merely to the Father and Son. Well does Bishop Kaye say, "In my opinion the passage in Tertullian, far from containing an allusion to 1 John v. 7, furnishes most decisive proof that he knew nothing of the verse." *

* The Ecclesiastical History of the second and third centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian, p. 550, second edition.

Another passage in Tertullian's works supposed to allude to the present verse is in his treatise *de Pudicitia* (chapter xxi.) "Et ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus in quo est *trinitas unius* divinitatis, Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus sanctus. Illam ecclesiam congregat quam Dominus in tribus posuit," &c. It would be difficult to tell why Tertullian might not write thus without the least acquaintance with 1 John v. 7.

Cyprian has also been adduced as a witness in favour of this verse. In his epistle to Jubaianus he writes: "Si baptizari quis apud haereticum potuit, utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit,—si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est; quaero cujus Dei? Si creatoris; non potuit, qui in eum non credidit: si Christi; non hujus potest fieri templum, qui negat Deum Christum: si spiritus sancti, *cum tres unum sint*, quomodo Spiritus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est?" Here Cyprian does not attempt to prove the unity of the three persons. He alludes to no passage affirming the unity. He simply takes it for granted, "*since* the three are one." He supposes it to be a truth already known from Scripture. It should also be noted, that the words in question have been suspected as supposititious. Though they appear in most editions of Cyprian's works, they are not in that of Erasmus. It would be worth while therefore to examine the best MSS. of Cyprian to ascertain the truth.

Another passage in the same father occurs in his treatise De ecclesiae unitate: "Dicit Dominus; ego et Pater unum sumus: et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est: *et tres* (or hi tres) *unum sunt;* et quisquam credit, hanc unitatem de divina firmitate venientem, sacramentis coelestibus cohaerentem, scindi in ecclesia posse, et voluntatem colliden-tium divortio separari."

Here the words are expressly introduced by the formula of citation *scriptum est.* It is said that there is first a quotation

from John x. 30, *I and my Father are one;* and next another from 1 John v. 7. This is the most plausible proof of the passage being quoted by an early Latin writer. Let us look closely at it.

Cyprian's treatise *on the unity of the church* abounds with references to Tertullian's against Praxeas; and in writing this passage it is not improbable that he had Tertullian in his eye. The one closely followed the other. Again, if Cyprian quotes the seventh verse, how can he call the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *sacramenta coelestia, heavenly mysteries.* It is appropriate to call the spirit, the water, and the blood, *heavenly mysteries*, if it be thought that they mystically represented the Trinity. May not therefore the citation here be from the eighth verse, not the seventh? This is at least possible, for the final clauses of the two verses are alike in the Latin version, though different in Greek. Hence it is impossible to judge from a mere quotation of this clause in a Latin writer, whether he alludes to the seventh or eighth verse. He may refer to the one equally with the other. But does not Cyprian affirm that the words *et tres unum sunt* are written of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? How then can they refer to the spirit, the water, and the blood in the eighth verse? To these questions we reply, that the Latin fathers interpreted *spiritus, aqua, et sanguis* in the eighth verse *mystically*, understanding by them *Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.* Hence we suppose that Cyprian may have quoted the eighth verse in its *mystical* sense; and we have seen already the presumption arising from the use of *sacramenta coelestia* that he *did* so quote. The presumption is strengthened by the fact, that Facundus, bishop of Hermiana in Africa, about the middle of the sixth century, understood Cyprian to cite the eighth verse. Facundus attempts to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by a mystical interpretation of the eighth verse, appealing to Cyprian, who, he alleges, gives the same expla-

nation. Hence we should believe the assertion of one who lived in the same country and used the same version with Cyprian. Thus the conclusion follows, that the words of this father, on which the advocates of 1 John v. 7 lay so great stress, do not contain a quotation from the seventh verse, but a spiritual application of the eighth.

But the testimony of Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe in Africa, who flourished in the sixth century, is brought to neutralise that of Facundus. "Let us now make a very probable supposition—namely, that Fulgentius understood Cyprian to quote the seventh verse instead of the eighth. Fulgentius had in the margin, or possibly in the text, of his copy of St. John's epistle, this disputed verse; which he was anxious to retain as a very useful weapon against the Arians. Knowing, as he must have known, that it held its place in the epistle by a very dubious title—and perhaps believing that it had some right to be there—he would naturally endeavour to strengthen its claims as much as he could. And this purpose he carried into effect by producing something which looked very like Cyprian's judgment in its favour."*

In like manner Phoebadius, a Gallican bishop about the middle of the fourth century, is supposed to have referred to the seventh verse. In his treatise against the Arians, (chap. 45) he says, "Sic alius a Filio Spiritus, sicut alius a Patre Filius. Sic tertia in Spiritu ut in Filio secunda persona: unus tamen Deus omnia, *quia tres unum sunt.*" These words are taken from Tertullian's treatise against Praxeas.

Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, who is placed about the year 440, is also thought to have cited the seventh verse.

"Item in epistola sua Johannes ponit: Tria sunt quae testimonium perhibent, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus. Quid in hoc indicatur? RESPON. Simile huic loco etiam illud MIHI

* See a Vindication of the literary character of the late Professor Porson by Crito Cantabrigiensis, p. 274.

videtur, quod ipse in Evangelio suo de passione Christi loquitur dicens: Unus militum lancea latus ejus aperuit; et continuo exivit *sanguis* et *aqua;* et qui vidit, testimonium perhibuit. In eodem ipse de Jesu supra dixerat; inclinato capite tradidit *spiritum.* QUIDAM ergo ex hoc loco ita disputant: aqua baptismum, sanguis videtur indicare martyrium, spiritus vero ipse est, qui per martyrium transit ad dominum. PLURES tamen hic ipsam interpretatione mystica intelligunt Trinitatem eo quod," &c. &c.*

But these words fairly interpreted shew, that Eucherius applied the eighth verse mystically to the Trinity, contrary to what bishop Burgess argued. This has been plainly proved by Porson and Crito Cantabrigiensis, as well as by Griesbach.

Vigilius of Tapsus is the first that quotes or refers to the verse. He belonged to the end of the fifth century. In a work against Varimadus, published under the name of Idacius Clarus, these words occur: "Johannes evangelista ad Parthos: Tres sunt, inquit, qui testimonium perhibent in terra, aqua, sanguis et caro, et tres in nobis sunt; et tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in coelo, Pater, Verbum et Spiritus, et hi tres unum sunt." It has been supposed however, not without reason, that the work has been interpolated by later hands.

The next witness in favour of the verse is Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe about 507. In his work against the Arians he writes: "In Patre ergo et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, unitatem substantiae accipimus; personas confundere non audemus. Beatus enim Joannes Apostolus testatur: *tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in coelo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus; et tres unum sunt.* Quod etiam beatissimus martyr Cyprianus, in epistola *de Unitate Ecclesiae* confitetur, dicens, "Qui pacem Christi et concordiam rumpit, adversus Christum facit: qui alibi praeter Ecclesiam colligit, Christi Ecclesiam spargit." Atque ut unam ecclesiam unius Dei esse monstraret, haec con-

* Eucherii opp. p. 86. Basil, 1530.

festim testimonia de Scripturis inseruit: "Dicit Dominus, *Ego et Pater unum sumus:* et iterum, de Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, *Et hi tres unum sunt.*" Non ergo ex tribus partibus unum colimus Deum," &c.

In his treatise De Trinitate he writes: "En habes in brevi alium esse Patrem, alium Filium, alium Spiritum Sanctum; alium et alium in persona, non aliud et aliud in natura: et idcirco, *Ego*, inquit, *et Pater unum sumus. Unum* ad naturam referre nos docent, *sumus* ad personas. Similiter et illud: *Tres sunt*, inquit, *qui testimonium dicunt in coelo: Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus: et hi tres unum sunt.*

The verse is also quoted in a fragment of a treatise attributed to Fulgentius, against an Arian bishop Pinta.

There is also a fragment of a treatise against Fabianus assigned to the same writer in which the passage is alluded to: "Beatus vero Joannes Apostolus evidenter ait, Et tres unum sunt: quod de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto dictum, sicut superius, cum rationem flagitares, ostendimus."

From these places it would appear, that though Fulgentius was acquainted with the disputed verse, he had his doubts of its authenticity. The passage had begun to be written in his day, and he was desirous to retain it against the Arians.

Another argument is derived from the confession of faith, supposed to be drawn up by Eugenius at the end of the fifth century, and presented by the orthodox bishops of Africa to Huneric king of the Vandals, who was a zealous Arian. In this confession is the following passage: "Et ut adhuc luce clarius unius divinitatis esse cum Patre et Filio Spiritum S. doceamus, Joannis evangelistae testimonio comprobatur. Ait namque: *Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in coelo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus; et hi tres unum sunt.* Numquid ait, &c. *Sed tres*, inquit, *unum sunt.*" Here the passage in question is clearly quoted by these African bishops.

The whole narrative rests on the authority of Victor

Vitensis, a very suspicious writer. Besides, it is not said that the 363 bishops who went to Carthage *subscribed* it. Victor says nothing about *subscription*. And even if they *had* affixed their names, it is not probable that the majority of them would examine accurately every phrase, and compare it with the copies they had been accustomed to use. The *author* of the confession may have had it in his MS., but that all who subscribed the declaration believed it to be a genuine part of Scripture, is too much to affirm. Should we allow the entire story to be true, the Vandals cannot be supposed to have been conversant with Scripture MSS. or the writings of the early fathers. They did not strive to overcome their opponents by argument, but by force of arms. Hence the orthodox party might produce the verse as Scripture, with little fear of detection.

The author of the confession is not known. It has been ascribed to Victor, Eugenius, Vigilius. Porson thinks that it was written by Vigilius Tapsensis, and published under the name of Eugenius.*

Cassiodorus, a Roman senator of the sixth century, has also been quoted in favour of the verse. The words relating to the point are these:—"Cui rei testificantur in terra tria mysteria; aqua, sanguis, et spiritus: quae in passione Domini leguntur impleta: in coelo autem Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus; et hi tres unus est Deus." But an attentive examination of the passage with its surrounding context will shew, that the words quoted contain a mystical application of the eighth verse to the Trinity; and that they are not a quotation of the seventh. We believe that the three heavenly witnesses did *not* exist in the copy of Cassiodorus, as Porson and Crito Cantab. have shewn.

The passage is quoted by Ambrosius Anspertus in the eighth century, and by Etherius of Axum in Spain at the close

* Letters to Travis, p. 338.

of the same period. Indeed from the eighth century, it was commonly cited by ecclesiastical writers, because it was then in the Latin Bible.

At one time, Jerome was produced as a witness in favour of the authenticity, because in several editions of the Vulgate a prologue accompanies the Catholic epistles purporting to proceed from Jerome. But most critics have seen that the prologue is a forgery, written long after the age of Jerome. The writer boasts of having arranged the epistles in their proper order, refers particularly to the first epistle of John, and condemns the unfaithful translators who, while inserting the testimony of the water, the blood, and the spirit, had omitted that of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit. Even Martianay, who superintended the Benedictine edition of Jerome's works, condemned the prologue as spurious; though he inserted it in the edition. Thus the earliest writer in whom the passage appears is Vigilius, at the close of the fifth century; and every critic knows the character of the works attributed to him, and the uncertainty of Chifflet's reasons for claiming them.*

At what time the mystical application of the eighth verse to the Trinity first appeared, it is not easy to discover. Some think that Augustine was the first who ventured on that use of it. So Bishop Marsh has conjectured, when he says that "Augustine was induced in his controversy with Maximin to compose a gloss on the eighth verse." † The allegorical explanation was in all probability *prior* to that father; but he gave it his sanction, by which means its reception was greatly promoted. It is clear, that in the Latin church it was tolerably well known during the fifth and sixth centuries. "The gloss," says Marsh, "having once obtained credit in the Latin church, the possessors of Latin MSS. began to note it in the margin,

* Vigilii Tapsensis Vindiciae, pp. 64-68.

† Lectures on Divinity, part vi. p. 18, et seq.

by the side of the eighth verse. Hence the oldest of those Latin MSS. which have the passage in the margin have it in a different hand from that of the text. In later MSS. we find margin and text in the same hand, for transcribers did not venture immediately to move it into the body of the text, though in some MSS. it is interlined, but interlined by a later hand. After the eighth century the insertion became general."*

The mystical application of the eighth verse is a proof of the non-existence of the seventh. For if the seventh were known, to what purpose was the allegorical explanation of the eighth? On that supposition, no rational account of its origin can be given. But the mystical application of the eighth clearly shews that it was itself the origin of the seventh. Hence what is now the seventh verse, or in other words the gloss embodying the allegorical explanation, *followed*, at its first insertion, the eighth verse; just as a gloss naturally follows the text it is made upon.

But did not the disputed verse get into the first printed editions from Greek MSS.? On the publication of Erasmus's edition he was attacked by Lee, afterwards archbishop of York, and by Stunica, one of the Complutensian editors, for omitting it. He replied to both in two Apologies and professed his willingness in the former, which was an answer to Lee, to insert the verse in his next edition, should any Greek MS. be found containing it. And as such a MS. was found in England, he fulfilled his promise in inserting the clause in his third edition published in 1522, though he had strong suspicions about the *codex Britannicus* as he calls it.

This MS. is commonly believed to be identical with the Dublin or *codex Montfortianus*, notwithstanding the attempts that have been made to shew their diversity. For the passage appears thus in Erasmus's third edition: καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι τὸ

* Lectures on Divinity, part vi. p. 18, et seq.

μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν ἡ ἀληθεία· ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατὴρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι· καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, πνεῦμα, καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν. Thus the third edition of Erasmus differs from the cod. Britannicus in having the final clause καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν; and in the insertion of καὶ before ὕδωρ. Erasmus's description of the text of the *cod. Britannicus* also differs from *the Dublin MS.* for he says:—"Veruntamen, ne quid dissimulem, repertus est apud Anglos Graecus codex unus, in quo habetur quod in Vulgatis deest; scriptum est enim in hunc modum:"—ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατὴρ, λόγος καὶ πνεῦμα, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσιν· καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα· εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν, κ. τ. λ.* On another occasion he remarks, that "the British codex had οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς, while the Spanish edition (Complutensian Polyglott) had only καὶ οἱ τρεῖς, which was also the case in the spirit, water, and blood; that the British had ἕν εἰσι, the Spanish εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν; and finally, that the British added to the earthly witnesses καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσι, which was not here added in the Spanish edition."

But still, it is most probable that the *cod. Britannicus* and the Dublin MS. are the same; and that Erasmus, who never saw the MS. he gives an account of, made some mistakes in transcribing its text from the papers before him, as Porson long ago shewed.

There is less reason for believing that the Complutensian editors inserted the passage on the authority of Greek MSS. They read thus: ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσι. καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, κ. τ. λ. The Latin version in the same Polyglott is, *Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in celo, pater, verbum et spiritus sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt, et tres sunt qui, &c.* When Stunica was challenged by

* Apologia ad Stunicam.

Erasmus to produce his Greek evidence for the place, he appealed to no Greek MSS. He simply replied: *Sciendum est Graecorum codices esse corruptos; nostros vero ipsam veritatem continere.* This is a proof that the Greek MSS. used by the editors did not contain the disputed verse, especially when it is remembered that Stunica quotes the *codex Rhodiensis* in opposition to Erasmus in this very epistle of John, viz. on iii. 16 and v. 20. The editors have also affixed a marginal note to the Greek text—a circumstance very unusual with them, as only three instances of it occur in the whole edition. In this note, the object of which was to secure themselves from blame for printing the verse, we should expect their best defence of it. Yet they do not mention any Greek MS. that contains it, nor any various readings in Greek MSS. They simply appeal to Thomas Aquinas. When we add to this, the agreement of their Greek of the passage with the verse as it stands in their text of the Vulgate, it is certain that they had no Greek MSS. containing it. We believe therefore, that the editors took the passage *not* from Greek MSS. but from the modern copies of the Vulgate, Pseudo-Jerome, and Thomas Aquinas.

It was also asserted and maintained, that the text existed in some of the Greek MSS. used by Stephens, whence he inserted it in his text. In his third edition he cites seven Greek MSS. of the Catholic epistles of which three belonged to the Royal Library in Paris. Now it is his manner, when any words are omitted in his MSS., to place an obelus in his text before the first word, and a semicircle after the last, shewing the extent of the omission. But in this edition the semicircle comes after the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ in the seventh verse. Hence it has been inferred, that *these words only*, and not the entire passage, were wanting in his seven MSS. But it has been shewn by Simon, Marsh, and Porson that the semicircle was put by mistake in the wrong place. It ought to be after

ἐν τῇ γῇ in the eighth verse. None of the MSS. now in the Parisian Royal Library has the passage; and one of Stephens's MSS. at present in the library of Cambridge University is also without it. We say *one* of Stephens's MSS. now in Cambridge on the authority of Marsh, who has made it all but certain, in his letters to Travis, that this Cambridge MS. (codex Bezae) and β of Stephens are identical.

None of the other early editions need be canvassed for the purpose of ascertaining whether they derived the disputed passage from Greek MSS. It passed into Stephens's editions from the three last of Erasmus; Beza followed Stephens in inserting it; and thence it came into the Elzevir editions of 1624 and 1633, where it established itself as an integral part of the *received text.* It was also thought at one time, that Valla's *variae lectiones* afforded some evidence of a Greek MS. or MSS. in his possession which had the seventh verse. On 1 John, chap. v. there are only three notes, and the first of the three is on the words, *Et hi tres unum sunt.* Here he observes, "*Gr. Et hi tres in unum sunt,* εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι." Here a difference between the readings of the Greek and Latin is indicated. Now as the words *Et hi tres unum sunt* are in the Vulgate at the end both of verses 7 and 8, it was thought that Valla's note referred to the former, not the latter. If so, he had at least one Greek MS. with the seventh verse. But we believe that it has been made all but certain by various writers, especially by Porson,* hat Valla's Greek MSS. *wanted* the seventh verse; and that no argument can be derived from his silence in favour of the pinion that they had it. The note in question refers to the eighth verse, not to the seventh.

Of the seventh verse *in Greek*, we perceive the earliest germs in Greek scholia appended to the margin of MSS. Thus in 62 a scholiast remarks in the margin at the word πνεῦμα in the eighth verse; τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ αὐτος ἑαυτοῦ;

* Letters to Travis, p. 24, et seq.

on ἐν εἰσι he says, εἷς θεὸς, μία θεότης; and on verse 9 he adds to μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ: τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. In like manner, in a Parisian codex, 2247, it is remarked on verse 8: τουτέστι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ; and on ἐν εἰσιν; τουτέστι μία θεότης, εἷς θεός. Another scholion produced by Matthaei has: οἱ τρεῖς δὲ εἶπεν ἀρσενικῶς, ὅτι σύμβολα ταῦτα τῆς τριάδος.*

The entire verse appeared for the first time in Greek in a Greek version of the *Latin* Acts of the Lateran council held in 1215. There it had this form: ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατὴρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον· καὶ τοῦτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσιν.

In the fourteenth century Manuel Calecas, a monk of the Dominican order, *quotes* it in this form: τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, omitting ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ and οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσιν.

At the commencement of the fifteenth century, Joseph Bryennius, a Greek monk, quotes part of the sixth with the seventh and eighth verses thus: καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια· ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ ουρανῷ, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι. καὶ τρεῖς οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα.

But the whole treatise in which this passage occurs was not in two Moscow MSS. of Bryennius's works, examined by Matthaei.

The passage was inserted in the Sixtine Vulgate published 1590, and the Clementine editions 1592, &c. having previously been in the Complutensian Polyglott, the third edition of Erasmus 1522, in the various editions of Stephens 1546-1569, and in the editions of Beza 1565-1576, whence it passed into the Elzevir ones 1624, 1633.

After this survey of the external evidence against and for the passage, we believe no one will hesitate to conclude that it is spurious. The testimony against it is strong and over-

* See Griesbach's Diatribe in locum 1 Joann. v. 7, p. 638.

whelming. Let us now consider the *internal* evidence for and against it.

(1.) It is said that the connexion requires the seventh verse. The sense is not complete without it. But those who thus argue, assume that the words ἐν τῇ γῇ in the eighth verse are genuine; whereas they are equally spurious with ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, which are thought necessary to the antithesis. Although the words *in terra* in the eighth verse are wanting in some Latin MSS. which have not the heavenly witnesses, as we are informed by Stephens, Hentenius, Lucas Brugensis, and others; yet they are not found in the oldest copies. It is likely that they were inserted to correspond to the interpolated *in coelo* of the preceding context.

(2.) The grammatical structure of the original Greek requires the insertion of the seventh verse, else the latter part of the eighth must also be rejected. If the seventh verse do not precede, it is difficult to account for the use of the masculine gender in the eighth. We should expect τρία εἰσιν τὰ μαρτυροῦντα, because each of the witnesses to which the clause refers is in the neuter gender. But if the seventh verse be authentic, the writer might naturally carry on the same expression τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, since the spirit, water, and blood attest the same thing with the heavenly witnesses.

To this it may be replied, that the spirit, water, and blood are *personified* in the passage; and therefore the masculine gender is employed. They are introduced as speaking witnesses for the fact that Jesus has come and truly suffered, according to prophecy.

(3.) Some think, that from the existence of the article τὸ before ἓν εἰσιν in the last clause of the eighth verse, it must refer to ἕν in the preceding verse, and consequently that both verses are so inseparably connected that they must be retained or rejected together. This ingenious supposition is mentioned by Wolfius in his Curae Philologicae; and has been ably dis-

cussed by Middleton in his work on the Greek article. But it derives its weight solely from the supposition that the three earthly witnesses concur in testifying *the one thing* testified by the heavenly witnesses. If ἓν εἶναι in the seventh verse express *the consubstantiality of the divine persons*, the τὸ ἕν of the eighth verse can have no allusion to the word ἕν in the seventh verse. It is only in case the ἓν εἶναι in the seventh denotes *consent* or *unanimity* that this argument is valid. Now interpreters are not agreed that the heavenly and earthly witnesses attest the same thing. Bishop Burgess, the most strenuous defender of the disputed verse in modern times, thinks that the heavenly witnesses of the seventh verse attest the divine nature of Jesus; the earthly witnesses of the eighth verse, his human nature.

It is observed by Turton, that τὸ ἕν may be equivalent to τὸ αὐτό, just as in Philip. ii. 2, supposing τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες in that passage to be the genuine reading, in which case it is not necessary to refer the article to anything preceding.*

(4.) It is said that the diction is characteristic of John the apostle. The term *Word* is applied to Christ by no other evangelist or apostle; and in the fourth gospel he often speaks of the *witness* of the Father and the Holy Spirit.

It is difficult to see the force of this argument. No expressions identical with those in 1 John v. 7 occur in John's authentic writings; and besides, it is easy to *manufacture out of what he has written* similar sentiments and phraseology.

On the other hand, the connexion is clearer and the sense easier of apprehension without the disputed words. The opponents of their authenticity argue that internal evidence is *against* the passage.

(1.) John never uses ὁ πατὴρ and ὁ λόγος as correlates; but always ὁ πατὴρ and ὁ υἱός. In the same way all the New

* Vindication of the literary character of Professor Porson, &c. p. 352.

Testament writers employ the terms. Hence the phraseology is foreign to the usage of the New Testament.

(2.) We should expect that the heavenly witnesses ought to be placed *after* the earthly ones; since the preceding context had referred to the earthly. The oldest copies of the Vulgate have them indeed in that order, but then

(3.) There is no proper relation between the water, the blood, and the spirit, and the Father, the Word, and the Spirit. Nor can any suitable contrast of the three be pointed out.

(4.) "Without the interpolation, certainly, the mention of the water, blood, and spirit in the sixth verse is, with great propriety, followed by the repetition of the same terms in the genuine text; which repetition is rendered emphatic by the exaltation of the spirit, water, and blood into three witnesses." *

(5.) "The whole design of the apostle being here to prove to men by witness, the truth of Christ's coming, I would ask how the testimony of the 'three in heaven' makes to this purpose? If their testimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Christ's coming? If it be, how is the testimony in heaven distinguished from that on earth? It is the same spirit which witnesses in heaven and in earth. If in both cases it witnesses to us men, wherein lies the difference between its witnessing in heaven and its witnessing in earth? If in the first case it does not witness to men, to whom doth it witness? And to what purpose? And how does its witnessing make to the design of St. John's discourse? Let them make good sense of it who are able. For my part, I can make none." †

We believe that internal evidence is *against* the passage as well as the external; and therefore reject the whole as certainly spurious.

* Porson, Letters, &c. p. 397.

† Sir Isaac Newton, Opp. vol. v. pp. 528-529, ed. Horsley.

Matthew vi. 13.

Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

"For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever. Amen."

The authenticity of these words has been much contested. Many have been so long accustomed to regard them as a part of the Lord's prayer, that they think it impious to disturb them, or to call in question their divine authority; while others do not scruple to set them aside on the ground of substantial evidence.

We shall adduce the evidence on both sides.

In favour of the clause we have the following authorities:—

1. It is found in all the Greek MSS. yet examined except eight. It is contained in the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem-Syriac versions; in the Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, Slavonic. It is in a very few MSS. of the Memphitic in the margin, in the Erpenian Arabic, and the Persian of the London Polyglott. It is also in some MSS. of the Latin version. The *apostolic constitutions* have it once in the usual form, once in another manner. Thus in (vii. 24) they have: ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμην, which may be said to contain the germ of its present form. But in iii. 18 they exhibit it fully.

2. It is found in Isidore of Pelusium, Chrysostom sometimes, Theophylact, Euthymius, German of Constantinople but differently from the usual way. Pseudo-Ambrose gives a doxology much more copious than the present; but in other places he repeats the Lord's prayer without it, and omits all mention of it in his explanations.

Such is the amount of external evidence in favour of the words. The *internal* may be summed up in the words of Calvin: "The clause is so exactly suitable, for it was added

not only for the purpose of kindling our hearts to seek the glory of God and of reminding us of the proper object of our prayers, but likewise to teach us that our prayers which are here dictated to us, are built on no other foundation than God alone, lest we should lean on our own merits."*

The authorities against the doxology's authenticity are these:—

1. It is omitted in B. D. Z. i. 17 (but this has ἀμήν) 118, 130, 209, and those very ancient MSS. out of which Luke (xi. 2-4) was interpolated. There is also a scholium in several MSS. examined by Wetstein, Birch, and Matthaei to this effect: τὸ δέ· ὅτι σοῦ κ. τ. λ. ἔν τισιν οὐ κεῖται μέχρι τοῦ ἀμήν. The scholiast of cod. 36 on Luke observes, that Luke finishes the prayer with the words, *lead us not into temptation;* but that Matthew added, *but deliver us from evil.*

2. It is omitted in the Memphitic, the Arabic of the Roman edition (1591) and Polyglott, the Persian of Wheloc, the old Latin (except cod. Brixianus, San Germanensis 1. Bobbiensis has *quoniam est tibi virtus in saecula saeculorum*), the Vulgate (which has however *Amen*, though that too is absent from some MSS.)

3. The Greek fathers, even when they explain at length the Lord's prayer and its several parts, omit the doxology; as Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Maximus, and Gregory of Nyssene. The last writer however concludes his exposition thus: χάριτι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι αὐτοῦ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα ἅμα τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεί, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν;† "by the grace of Christ, for his is the power and the glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always and for ever

* "Neque enim ideo solum addita est, ut corda nostra ad expetendam Dei gloriam accendat, et admoneat, quisnam esse debeat votorum nostrorum scopus, sed etiam ut doceat, preces nostras, quae hic nobis dictatae sunt, non alibi quam in Deo solo fundatas esse, ne propriis meritis nitamur."

† De Orat. Domin. orat. v.

and ever, Amen." Yet he does not give this as a part of the sacred text. In like manner, Caesarius adduces a doxology twice, not as a part of Scripture, but of a Liturgy: σοῦ ἐστι τὸ κράτος καὶ ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων;* "thine is the might, and the kingdom, and the power, and the glory of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, now and always, and for ever and ever." Euthymius blames the Massilians for despising *the invocation added by the fathers*, viz. τὸ παρὰ τῶν θείων φωστήρων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθηγητῶν προστεθὲν ἀκροτελεύτιον ἐπιφώνημα——τὸ ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐδὲ ἀκοῦσαι ἀνέχονται; "for thine is the kingdom and the glory of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The doxology is also omitted by the Latin fathers, Tertullian, Cyprian, Juvencus, Chromatius, Ambrose, Sedulius, Fulgentius, and Jerome, who did not find it in the gospel of the Nazarenes. Tertullian expressly calls the sixth petition, the *clausula* of the prayer.

Most authorities that omit the doxology omit Ἀμήν. But some add ἀμὴν which want the doxology.

As to internal arguments against the authenticity, two have been advanced, one by Bengel, the other by Tholuck. The former says: "In some such way we celebrate him, with which while we are sojourners and soldiers we ought to be content. When all the sons of God shall have arrived at the goal, there will be nothing but doxology in heaven; His Kingdom has come, his will has then been done, he has forgiven our sins, &c.; but petition was more suitable to the time when our Lord prescribed this formula of prayer to his disciples, than praise. Jesus was not yet glorified," &c. † But Tholuck

* Dialog. I. Qu. 29, and Dial. III. 116.

† "Scopus orationis dominicae hic est, ut doceamur paucis petere ea quorum *indigemus*, v. 8, et ipsa oratio, etiam citra doxologiam, summam

appositely observes, that this objection takes too little notice of the prayer's *etiological* form.

Tholuck states that the arrangement of the three predicates βασιλεία, δύναμις, and δόξα would correspond better with the two triads of petitions, if the δύναμις stood before the βασιλεία.*

To this we may add, that there is no doxology in Luke where the same prayer is recorded; nor do any MSS. of his gospel which have not been interpolated exhibit a conclusion similar to that here found. This corroborates the view of those who look upon the doxology as spurious. Should it be said that the words were struck out of the text in Matthew to render it more conformable to Luke, the allegation is not probable. It would have been marvellous that a few daring transcribers or commentators should have omitted the doxology; and if so many writers of undoubted reputation and piety could have joined in the omission of a most beautiful and appropriate conclusion to the model of prayer taught by our Lord. Hence we cannot receive the explanation given by Matthaei, nor admit the probability of his conjecture that the corruption is to be traced to Origen.

The words are expunged from the text by the great majority of critical editors, the Complutensian ones, Erasmus, Bengelius, Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others. They are also reckoned spurious by Grotius, Camerarius, Luther, Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Pellican, Bucer, Melancthon, Drusius, Walton, Mill, Grabe, Pfaff, Penn, De Wette, Tholuck, &c. &c.

laudis divinae imbibit.—Celebramus eum autem (patrem coelestem) tali fere modo, quo peregrinantes et militantes contenti esse debemus. Ubi ad metam pervenerit universitas filiorum Dei, mera fiet in coelo doxologia *sanctificetur, nomen Dei nostri: venit regnum ejus, facta est voluntas ejus, remisit nobis peccata, etc.* praesertim tempori illi, quo Dominus hanc formulam discipulis praescripsit, convenientior erat rogatio quam hymnus. Jesus nondum erat glorificatus, etc."—Gnomon.

* Auslegung der Bergpredigt, p. 388, third edition.

Looking at the state of evidence on both sides, there can be little doubt that the words are not a part of the prayer as at first spoken and written.

It is an important circumstance that B. D. Z. are against them, whose value cannot be outweighed by K. H. V. Δ with the whole host of cursive copies. The evidence of versions is contradictory; but most of the fathers knew nothing of the words. The oldest MSS. and the very old Memphitic and Latin versions want them, shewing that the *western* class in both its families was a stranger to the clause. Very important however is the Peshito as a witness for the authenticity. Yet in this case, as in others, there is good ground for suspecting that it has been interpolated. In the Syriac gospels of Cureton the doxology is *shorter* than in its present state; shewing that it was at the time *in progress* of formation. It had not then grown to its full size.

The fathers are decidedly against the authenticity. Such critics as Origen and Jerome knew nothing of it in their day, or did not regard it as a part of our Saviour's words. It seems to have been appended in some copies at least about the middle of the fourth century to the Lord's prayer; and therefore it is in Chrysostom and the Gothic version; unless indeed the works of the Constantinopolitan father have suffered interpolation here, as in other cases. It is most likely that the origin is Constantinopolitan or Asiatic, as Bengel rightly supposed.

The variety of forms in which the words appear is also adverse to their authenticity; for had they been a part of Matthew's gospel at first, we cannot account for the shapes in which they appear.

The interpolation may be explained in a very natural way. The clause was transferred from liturgical forms to the text of the New Testament. The custom of responding to prayers passed from the Jewish to the Christian church; the people sometimes pronouncing the single word *Amen*, and sometimes

more. This explains the different modes in which the clause appears in different MSS., and the retention of ἀμήν in several copies which have not the preceding (interpolated) words. We believe therefore, that the doxology originated in the ancient liturgies.*

Matthew xix. 17.

Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός.

"Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God."

Such is the reading of the received text in this place.

Another reading is: Τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.

Here from the nature of the clauses and of the evidence, it will be better to consider them separately.

Τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.

1. This is found in B. D. (D., and Origen once, omit τοῦ) L. 1, 22, *x* of Matthaei *a secunda manu*, where it is written twice, once in the usual manner, afterwards in this way. The same reading exists in the Memphitic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Armenian, in the margin of the Philoxenian, the Vulgate, the old Latin (except cod. Brixianus). Origen quotes it four times. Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria sometimes, the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite, Antiochus, Novatian, Jerome, Augustine Juvencus also have it.

2. On the other hand, the received reading Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν, is found in all MSS. of the Constantinopolitan recension, including C. E. K. S. V. Δ; in both the Syriac versions, in the Arabic, Persic, and Slavonic versions, the cod. Brixianus of the old Latin version; in Justin Martyr, Cyril of Alexandria mostly, Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and others. Δ has τί με ἀγαθόν.

* See Roediger's Synopsis Evangeliorum, &c. Appendix iii. p. 229, et seq.

Εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός.

1. This is found in B. D. (but D. omits ὁ) L. 1, 22, the Armenian version, the Jerusalem-Syriac, some codices of the old Latin, Origen who quotes it three times, and Justin Martyr possibly.

2. On the other hand, οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός is found in all MSS. of the Constantinopolitan class, in the various versions not quoted for the other, in Chrysostom, the author of a Dialogue concerning the Trinity, Ambrose and others. U. omits ὁ the article.

There are other varieties of reading as

Εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεός supported by the Memphitic, Vulgate, and many MSS. of the old Latin, Novatian, &c.

Εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός ὁ πατήρ, and εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός θεός ὁ πατήρ, are supported by very few documents.

It is apparent that our choice lies between the common reading and τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός. But it is not easy to decide between them; for the authorities are not preponderating in favour of either. B. D. are certainly weighty documents for the latter reading; but such MSS. as C. and Δ for the former are also important. The evidence of versions and fathers is contradictory and perplexing.

Nor can much be inferred from internal considerations. It is urged with plausibility that the common reading has arisen from a desire to make Matthew's text conformable to those of Mark and Luke. It is also the easier and less difficult reading; and should therefore be regarded as inferior to the more obscure.

On the other side, in favour of the common reading it may be said that it arose from anti-Arian polemics, as Baumgarten-Crusius thought, or by the arbitrary meddling of Origen, as Wetstein supposed; or that it originated in the accidental omission of ἀγαθὲ in the sixteenth verse, by which τί με λέγεις

ἀγαθὸν became incongruous, and had to be altered into τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. But these are mere conjectures.

On the whole, we prefer the latter reading with Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf.*

Matthew xxi. 28-31.

1. Ἄνθρωπος εἶχε τέκνα δύο· καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε· τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον, ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν οὐ θέλω· ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθε. Καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ ἑτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἐγὼ κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθε. Τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησε τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ὁ πρῶτος.

This is Griesbach's reading, differing from the received one only in having ἑτέρῳ instead of δευτέρῳ, which is an unimportant variation.

2. Another form in which the passage appears is with ὁ ὕστερος instead of ὁ πρῶτος.

3. A third form is: καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε· τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον, ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ἐγὼ κύριε καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν. Καὶ προσελθών τῷ ἑτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω· ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν, κ. τ. λ. as No. 1.

There are also minor variations, but such as are comparatively trifling; and therefore they may be omitted.

It should also be observed, that some authorities which have ὕστερος (or ἔσχατος) instead of πρῶτος (No. 2), follow the order of No. 3, while others of them retain the common order.

2. We may put together the authorities for ὕστερος and its equivalents ἔσχατος and δεύτερος, in verse 31. For this reading then we have, B. D. 4, 13, 69, the Jerusalem-Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, Arabic of the Polyglott, Vulgate, old Latin, Hippolytus, Hilary, Isidore, John of Damascus, Pseudo-Athanasius, Augustine, Juvencus, &c. It should be remarked

* See Griesbach's Commentarius Criticus, part i. p. 154.

however, that all MSS. of the old Latin and the Vulgate have not this reading. Yet the best of both have it, the codd. Vercellensis, Veronensis, Corbeiensis of the one; and the Evangelium Palatinum of Jerome's translation. *Novissimus* was the Latin reading. Jerome appeals to other copies which read *primus*—ex. gr. the cod. Brixianus.

3. This form of the text is contained in *some* of the authorities which read ὁ ὕστερος or some of its equivalents, such as B. 4, 13, 69, 124, 238, 262, 346, the Memphitic, Jerusalem-Syriac, Arabic of the Polyglott, and of Erpenius, Isidore, John of Damascus, Pseudo-Athanasius, and some MSS. of the old Latin and Jerome's version. It is not in D. and most MSS. of the old Latin, and the Vulgate.

With the exception of the authorities in favour of 2 and 3, all others have the received reading (1.)

In regard to No. 2, we are inclined to adopt it as the true reading on the valuable authority of B. and D. as well as the old Latin and Jerome's translation. This is corroborated by the fact that Hippolytus states the answer of the Jews to Christ was *the latter*, not *the former;* along with Origen's testimony of the answers of the two sons being in the order in which they stand in the received text—*i. e.* the first son refusing and afterwards going; the second promising and not going. Lachmann has accordingly taken ὁ ὕστερος instead of ὁ πρῶτος into the text.

No. 2, which we look upon as the original reading, led to No. 3. It was found difficult to explain the passage with the answers of the two sons as they are, and the Jews' reply to our Lord ὁ ὕστερος; and therefore the order was inverted to obviate the difficulty. Even B. has the order changed, in which however, Lachmann has not followed it, and properly so.

The difficulty is very considerable. How could the Jews say that ὁ ὕστερος did the will of his father, when it was the *first* son who repented and went into the vineyard according to

the father's desire? The expression ὁ ὕστερος must be explained with Schweizer and Tregelles, *he who afterwards went.* It does not refer to *the order* in which the two sons are mentioned, but to his *after* conduct; or in other words, to the expression ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθε.

The common reading πρῶτος was another expedient for evading the difficulty besides the inversion of the order of the answers given by the two sons. The reading of the old Latin version adopted by Lachmann, as being the most difficult, and as explaining the origin of the others, should be preferred as the true one.

Matthew xxvii. 35, 36.

[Ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου· διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον]. Καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ.

"That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots."

The words enclosed in brackets are omitted in many authorities.

1. They are wanting in all the uncial MSS. except Δ, such as A. B. D. E. F. G. H. K. L. M. S. U. V. and a great many cursive ones enumerated by Scholz. They are also wanting in a number of *evangelistaria.*

2. They are not in the old Syriac, at least in the MSS. of it, and in some editions also; and hence a note in the margin of the later Syriac states that they are not in the old Syriac nor in two [or three] Greek copies. Neither are they found in the Arabic of the Polyglott, the Persic of Wheloc, the Memphitic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Slavonic. They are also wanting in many MSS. of the Vulgate, as well as the Sixtine edition; and in many MSS. of the old Latin, among which is the cod. Brixianus.

3. Chrysostom, Titus of Bostra, Euthymius, Theophylact, Origen, Hilary, Augustine, Juvencus omit them. On the strength of this ancient evidence, the passage is rightly expunged from the editions of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf. The testimony in favour of the passage is quite unimportant, consisting of Δ and a great number of cursive MSS., some MSS. of the old Latin and Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, the Jerusalem-Syriac, the Arabic of the Roman edition, the Persian of the Polyglott, and Armenian versions. Thus external evidence is decisive against the passage. It seems to have been at first a marginal annotation borrowed from John xix. 24, and afterwards taken into the text. Schulz however calls attention to the fact, that no other evangelist except Matthew uses the formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν, and that διὰ for ὑπὸ which the Latin version appears to have had in the original whence it was taken, is conformable to Matthew's usual manner.

Luke xxii. 43, 44.

Ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο. ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

"And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

Authorities are divided as to the insertion or omission of these words. Let us look at the evidence on both sides.

They are omitted by the following:—

1. A. B. 13, 69, 124. It should be observed however, that the Alexandrine MS. A., though it wants the verses, has the Ammonian section in the margin. In 13 the first hand wrote only ὤφθη δέ. A later hand supplied the rest in the margin.

In 69 they are put after Matt. xxvi. 39. They are also omitted in *f* or cod. Brixianus of the old Latin, in the Sahidic version, and one MS. of the Memphitic. They are likewise omitted in evangelistaria in the lesson commencing with xxii. 39 and ending with xxiii. 1; though the same documents have them in the lesson Matt. xxvi. 2—xxvii. 2, where after the twentieth verse are introduced John xiii. 3-17; and after the thirty-ninth, Luke xxii. 43-45.

In L. the verses want the Ammonian number and Eusebian canon. The verses are written, but marked with asterisks, in E. S. V. Δ. 24, 36, 161, 166, 274; and with obeli in 123, 344.

Hilary states: "Et in Graecis et in Latinis codicibus complurimis, vel de adveniente angelo vel de sudore sanguinis nil scriptum reperiri."* "In very many Greek and Latin copies nothing was written either about the appearance of an angel or the bloody sweat." Jerome testifies much the same thing. "In quibusdam exemplaribus tam Graecis quam Latinis invenitur, Scribente Luca: *Apparuit illi Angelus*," &c.† In like manner a scholium on cod. 34 says: "It should be known that some copies have not the words relating to the drops [of blood]." Epiphanius writes: Ἀλλὰ καὶ "ἔκλαυσε" κεῖται ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκ. εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις . . . . . ὀρθόδοξοι δὲ ἀφείλοντο τὸ ῥητόν, κ. τ. λ.‡ "But he even 'wept' is found in the gospel according to Luke in the uncorrected copies, but the orthodox have taken away that which was said," &c.

The Syrians are censured by Photius, the Armenians by Nicon, Isaac the Catholic, and others, for expunging the passage.

* De Trinitate, Lib. x. p. 1062, ed. Benedict.

† Opp. vol. iv. p. 521, ed. Benedict.

‡ Epiphanii Ancorat. ed. Petavii, vol. ii. p. 36.

2. The passage is retained by

D. F. G. H. K. L. M. Q. U. X. and by all other MSS. except those already mentioned. It is also in all versions with the exception of the few specified before, as the old Latin, (except the Brescian codex), the Vulgate, two MSS. of the Memphitic, &c. It is referred to by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Chrysostom, Titus of Bostra, Caesarius, &c. The Eusebian canon in M. recognises it.

According to Granville Penn, there is internal evidence which speaks decidedly for the spuriousness of these verses. He says, that it was not in the power of an angel to supply strength to Christ's spiritual nature, though his human nature received food from the hands of angels after his temptation.* But this takes for granted that the angel who appeared gave strength to his divine nature. We are disposed to think that his *human* nature received help from angels at this time.

The words are retained by Griesbach, Scholz, and Tischendorf. Lachmann puts them in brackets.

In considering the evidence for and against them, we observe, that though omitted by A. and B., both Justin and Irenaeus were acquainted with their existence. Nor can any probable cause be assigned for their insertion, supposing them spurious; whereas it is likely that they may have been omitted from doctrinal scruples finding the ideas contained in them unworthy of the divinity of Jesus. This is intimated by Epiphanius, who speaks of the orthodox expunging the words through fear of infringing the doctrine of Christ's proper deity. Hence we are inclined to retain the passage as a constituent part of the genuine gospel according to Luke.

Acts viii. 37.

Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ἔξεστιν· ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε· Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

* Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, p. 248.

"And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

It is now very generally agreed among critics that these words are spurious. The evidence against them is indeed sufficient to cause their rejection.

1. They are wanting in A. B. C. G. H. and upwards of sixty other MSS. which have been cited. They are also omitted in many Lectionaries.

2. Of versions, they are not in the Memphitic, Sahidic, Old Syriac, Ethiopic, Erpenian Arabic, Slavonic in two MSS.

3. Chrysostom passes over the passage twice. Œcumenius has it at least in one MS., Theophylact once, and Bede.

1. On the other hand, the words are in E. and a considerable number of cursive MSS., eleven of which are formally cited by Scholz.

2. It is in the Vulgate (not the codex Amiatinus) the Armenian, the Arabic of the Polyglott, the Slavonic but not in two MSS. The Philoxenian has it with an asterisk.

3. It is quoted by Irenaeus (Greek and Latin), Œcumenius, Theophylact twice, Cyprian, Praedestinatus, Pacian, Jerome, Augustine, Bede who says that it was not in the Greek.

It should be observed that the words are not contained in the same form in the authorities which have them. Many varieties exist, as may be seen from the editions of Griesbach, Scholz, and Tischendorf. This fact, together with the nature of the evidence, leaves little doubt on the mind that the passage is an interpolation, which, having been written at first as a marginal note, was taken into the text. It has been suggested by Meyer, that it was derived from some baptismal liturgy, and was added here lest it might appear that the eunuch was baptized without evidence of his faith.

Acts xx. 28.

Προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου.

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

In this passage there is a great variety of reading. Let us consider each form of it by itself.

1. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. *The church of God.*
2. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου. *The church of the Lord.*
3. ————κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ. *The church of our Lord and God.*
4. ————κυρίου θεοῦ. *The church of the Lord God.*
5. ————θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου. *The church of our God and Lord.*
6. ————Χριστοῦ. *The church of Christ.*

The evidence in favour of each is the following:—

1. θεοῦ.

(*a.*) This is supported by B. and about 20 cursive MSS.

Formerly it was doubted about the true reading of the cod. Vaticanus. But it certainly reads τοῦ θεοῦ, as Birch, who had seen the MS., gave the reading of it at first in his *Variae Lectiones* ad textum Act. app. (p. 49). Two years later, however, he unfortunately threw doubts upon his own statement, in the Prolegomena to his various readings on the Apocalypse (p. 39). We are assured by Tischendorf, who saw the MS. more than once, that it has the received reading in this place. But it has been said, that though it has θεοῦ *now*, it had κυρίου at first. It has suffered correction in the place. This affirmation of erasure and revisal in the present word rests on no foundation. All that Gabler and Kuinoel give for it is the circumstance that B. in reading here τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου agrees with the MSS. with which it generally coincides in

other places and which read κυρίου. Hence it is concluded, that as B. *commonly* coincides with the copies that exhibit κυρίου, and agrees with them moreover in a certain reading in this very place (τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου), it must have originally had κυρίου in the text, just as they have; for which θεοῦ was subsequently interpolated. We greatly prefer the testimony of eye-witnesses to this kind of reasoning, which is by no means conclusive.

(*b.*) It is also in the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac in the text, and a Syriac Lectionary in the Vatican, of the eleventh century. It should be observed that it is in such MSS. of the Vulgate as the cod. *Amiatinus, demidovianus, toletanus, &c.*

(*c.*) Epiphanius, Antiochus, Caelestine, Œcumenius, Ambrose, Orosius, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, Ferrandus, Primasius, Martin, Bede, Etherius have θεοῦ. Theophylact has it twice.

Ignatius in his epistle to the Ephesians uses the phrase αἷμα θεοῦ. But in the larger recension he has Χριστοῦ instead of θεοῦ. It would appear however from the context, that he does not adopt it as a quotation; nor is it likely that he had in his mind Acts xx. 28. Basil in his ἠθικά* has θεοῦ, but Wetstein doubts whether he has been rightly edited. Χριστοῦ is said by Griesbach to be in the *Breviarium*, by which he can only mean Basil's *Regulae brevius tractatae.* We have searched for it there in vain. Chrysostom has θεοῦ three times, but once he has κυρίου. Besides his commentary on the place is εἴγε ὁ δεσπότης ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, which appears to require κυρίου, as Mill remarked.† One MS. too omits the words from ὁ δεσπότης to ἐκκλησίας. Athanasius in his first epistle to Serapion has θεοῦ, but one MS. reads κυρίου. Another has Χριστοῦ. Thus though the first edition of Athanasius has θεοῦ, four MSS. have other readings.‡ With regard to Ibas,

* Reg. 80, cap. 16, vol. ii. p. 385, ed. Paris 1618.

† Chrysostomi Opp. vol. ix. p. 333, ed. Benedict.

‡ See Opp. vol. i. part ii. p. 653, ed. Benedict.

it should be also observed, that though he has θεοῦ in Greek, yet in the Latin version it is *Domini*, in his epistle to Marinus in the Acts of the council of Chalcedon as printed by Mansi.* Ambrose, though rightly cited as we believe for θεοῦ,† is said by Bengelius to have both θεοῦ and κυρίου. Is not this critic mistaken in the affirmation? Besides Ignatius, Tertullian uses the phrase, sanguis Dei.‡ John of Damascus, Theophylact, Leontius, and others also have it; though the expression was considered improper and unscriptural by some, as by Origen against Celsus,§ by Chrysostom,‖ by Theodoret,¶ by Isidore, and by Gregory Nyssene,** &c.

2. κυρίου.

(*a.*) This reading is supported by A. C. D. E. and fourteen cursive MSS.

(*b.*) It is in the Memphitic, Sahidic, Armenian, and the margin of the later Syriac. According to Griesbach, the Ethiopic probably had this reading, since it commonly agrees with the Memphitic and Armenian. The term employed he looks upon as ambiguous; for it is always employed whether θεὸς or κύριος be in the Greek. On the contrary, Wakefield, pronouncing the assertion of Griesbach most unjustifiable, says that the "Ethiopic translator never employs the word here introduced but to signify *the supreme God alone.*"†† But the Ethiopic New Testament published by the Bible Society has Χριστοῦ. It is likely that Ethiopic MSS. differ in their reading according as they are older or younger. It was also in the old Latin, and accordingly we find it in the *cod. Cantab.* and in E., that is, *cod. Laudianus.*

(*c.*) It is found in Eusebius, the Apostolic Constitutions (belonging to the third century), Didymus, Ammonius, Maxi-

* Vol. iv. p. 1578. † De Spiritu Sancto, Lib. ii. ‡ Ad Uxor. Lib. ii. cap. 3.
§ Lib. ii. ‖ Homil. i. on Acts. ¶ Dial. iii.
** See Wetstein, vol. ii. pp. 597, 598.
†† Translation of the New Testament, vol. iii. p. 147.

mus, Theodore Studites, the Latin interpreter of Irenaeus, Lucifer, Augustine, Jerome, Sedulius, Alcimus. One MS. of Athanasius has this reading. Chrysostom has it once, *i.e.* on Ephes. iv. 12; and probably here too. Theophylact has it three times. The Latin of Ibas (ad Marin.) has *Dominus*.

3. κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ.

This reading is supported by C. *a tertia manu*, G. H. and upwards of a hundred cursive MSS. It is also in six lectionaries. The Slavonic version also has it; and Theophylact once.

4. κυρίου θεοῦ.

This is found in 3, 95 *a secunda manu*, and the Arabic version in the Polyglott. The Georgian has κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ with the article between.

5. θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου.

This is in codex 47.

6. Χριστοῦ.

This reading is supported by the Peshito, the Erpenian Arabic, Origen once. In another place Origen reads τὴν ἐκκλησίαν without the genitive. It is also in three codices of Athanasius; and twice in Theodoret. The larger recension of Ignatius has ἐν αἵματι Χριστοῦ. Basil in his *Regulae brevius tractatae* is also said to have Χριστοῦ once. Fulgentius (pro fide catholica) has it once.

In weighing the external evidence in favour of these varieties, it is obvious that Nos. 4 and 5 must be at once discarded as ill supported. No. 3 is supported by two uncial MSS., and by a very large number of cursive ones, but these are insufficient to recommend it to our adoption. No. 6 wants MS. evidence, though it has one important version, *i.e.* the Peshito in its favour. Hence the choice lies between Nos. 1 and 2. As far as the testimony of MSS. goes, τοῦ κυρίου is undoubtedly best supported. It has in its favour four uncial ones, A. C. D. E.; while τοῦ θεοῦ has only B. The versions are on the same side; for the old Latin must be preferred to

the Vulgate. The testimony of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers is very uncertain and contradictory. A passage in Athanasius has been quoted as bearing on this point. Griesbach affirms that Athanasius (contra Apollinar.) denied the occurrence of αἷμα θεοῦ in all Scripture. Here however he follows Wetstein who gives the words of Athanasius thus: οὐδαμοῦ δὲ αἷμα θεοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς παραδεδώκασι αἱ γραφαὶ. Ἀρειάνων τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμήματα. But though it be true that the Paris edition of Athanasius's works published in the year 1627 (vol. i. p. 645), has the words thus, yet they are not correctly given. Instead of καθ' ἡμᾶς, we should read δίχα σαρκὸς, as indeed the Latin version (*citra carnem*) in the Paris edition itself shews. The Benedictine edition (1698 Paris, vol. i. p. 951) has δίχα σαρκὸς; and the only various reading noticed in it is διὰ σαρκός. According to the true language then of Athanasius, he asserts that the Scriptures never speak of Christ suffering as God, without mentioning or implying his human nature; and in the next sentence he proceeds to say that "the Holy Scriptures, speaking of God in the flesh, and of the flesh of God when he became man, *mention the blood*, and sufferings, and resurrection of the body of God." Dr. Burton is probably wrong in saying that "Wetstein inserted καθ' ἡμᾶς [καθ' ὑμᾶς] from his own head, and left out the words δίχα σαρκὸς, upon which the whole meaning of the passage turns;"* for he may have quoted from the specified edition.

With regard to θεοῦ, there are no certain traces of it to be found in the fathers before Epiphanius and Ambrose; nor was it urged by the orthodox during those fierce controversies with heretics which prevailed in the fourth and fifth centuries; though it would have been appropriate against the latter. But Ammonius, the Apostolic Constitutions, Eusebius, Lucifer, Augustine, and Jerome, clearly knew and read κυρίου; and in

* Testimonies of the Anti-Nicene fathers to the Divinity of Christ, in theological works, vol. ii. pp. 20, 21.

opposition to them, what is the weight of those who can be adduced as *certainly* in favour of θεοῦ? Hence we believe that κυρίου is better supported by ancient writers, both Greek and Latin, than θεοῦ. Thus external evidence in its threefold division favours κυρίου more than θεοῦ or any other reading; since the most ancient MSS. have it (except B.), and those too belonging to different classes; while, as Griesbach observes, they are internally the best, scarcely ever agreeing in any reading that is not approved by the most skilful critics. Then again, ancient versions belonging to different countries, and representing both oriental and occidental documents, have κυρίου; while many ancient fathers sanction it. It is therefore entitled to the preference on the ground of external evidence.

We shall now proceed to *internal* evidence.

In favour of ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, it has been alleged that the same phrase occurs often in the New Testament; whereas, on the contrary, ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου is nowhere found. And in an address made by Paul, that reading should be preferred which is conformable to the Pauline phraseology, viz., τοῦ θεοῦ for the ten instances (1 Corinth. i. 2; x. 32; xi. 16, 22; xv. 9. 2 Corinth. i. 1. Gal. i. 13. 1 Thes. ii. 14. 2 Thes. i. 4. 1 Timothy iii. 15), in which ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs, are all in Paul's epistles.

To this it may be replied, that Luke is the *writer*, not Paul himself; and therefore we should attend to the evangelist's style, not Paul's own. But Luke is accustomed to put ἐκκλησία without any adjunct. Besides, in this very discourse, the Father is distinguished from the Son by being called θεὸς; the latter κύριος, as may be seen from verses 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35. Hence the same distinction should be made in this twenty-eighth verse.

Again, it may be said that the more difficult, unusual, and harsh reading should be preferred to the easier one. This is true only when the harsher reading is supported at least by

some ancient and weighty testimonies. A reading unsupported by proper witnesses cannot be defended on the ground of its difficulty alone, as Griesbach has remarked.

It may also be objected, that κυρίου was borrowed from the Septuagint where the phrase ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου often occurs; and that the term being thus familiar to transcribers easily dropped from their pen. But this is quite improbable.

Still farther; Latin transcribers wrote *Dei* or rather *Di* for *Domini;* and from such Latin copies those Greek ones which have κυρίου were corrupted. But it is only the more recent Latin documents which have *Dei*, whereas the older have *Domini*. It is incredible that all the Greek MSS. which have κυρίου were corrupted from the Latin.

Michaelis says, that θεοῦ is probably the true reading, and all the others corrections or scholia, because it might easily give occasion to any of these, whereas none could so easily give occasion to θεοῦ. If Luke wrote θεοῦ, he thinks that the origin of κυρίου and Χριστοῦ may be explained either as corrections of the text, or as marginal notes; because *the blood of God* is a very extraordinary expression.* But it is not difficult to point out the mode in which θεοῦ might have arisen from κυρίου. Transcribers were familiar with ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, from its frequent occurrence in the New Testament. Hence they would prefer the more known expression to the unusual one.

And not only can we account for θεοῦ arising from κυρίου but also Χριστοῦ. The latter is obviously an interpretation or gloss intended to define the sense of the ambiguous term κυρίος. But if the authors of the gloss had found θεοῦ in their Greek copies, they would not have chosen Χριστοῦ to explain it, but some more suitable phrase, probably τοῦ υἱου τοῦ θεοῦ, as Griesbach suggests.

The various compound readings arose from the combination

* Introduction to the New Testament, vol. i. pp. 334, 335.

of the two simple ones κυρίου and θεοῦ; and therefore internal evidence is clearly against them.

It has been conjectured with some degree of probability by Griesbach, that θεοῦ was taken either from Paul's epistles or a parallel in 1 Peter v. 2, where we read ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες, κ. τ. λ.

From a general survey of the evidence, we are inclined to adopt τοῦ κυρίου as the most probable reading. It is best supported by the authority of documents, as well as internal considerations. It has been received by Grotius, Wetstein, Griesbach, Marsh, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Olshausen, Kuinoel, Meyer, De Wette, &c.

On the other hand, the received reading is followed by Mill, Wolf, Bengel, Matthaei, Rinck, Michaelis, Scholz, &c. But Scholz should consistently have edited κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ as the Constantinopolitan form of the text. By retaining τοῦ θεοῦ he has departed from his own principles.

INDEX.

I. PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATED OR EXPLAINED.

Genesis i. I. 410-414.
„ ii. I. 414-415.
„ ii. 24, I. 415-417.
„ iii. 15, I. 288.
„ iv. 8, I. 89, 419.
„ x. 21, I. 7, 8.
„ x. 25, I. 8.
„ xi. 5, I. 230.
„ xiv. 13, I. 6, 7.
„ xiv. 14, I. 90.
„ xv. 4, I. 230.

Exodus xii. 40, I. 86.
„ xx. 2-17, I. 432-442.
„ xxix. 35, I. 230.

Numbers xxiv. 24, I. 7, 8.

Leviticus ix. 21, I. 372.

Deuteronomy vi. 5-21, I. 432, 442.

Joshua xxi. 35, I. 421-427.

Judges xviii. 30, I. 408, 409.

1 Samuel vi. 19, I. 401-404.
„ xi. 14, I. 78.
„ xvii. 12-31, I. 397, 400.
„ xvii. 55 to xviii. 5, I. 401.
„ xxi. 5, I. 292.

2 Samuel xv. 7, I. 429, 430.
„ xxi. 1, I. 295.
„ xxii. 11, 12, I. 302.
„ xxiv. 13, I. 299.

1 Kings vi. 1, I. 380.
„ xxii. 43, I. 380.

2 Kings viii. 16, I. 379.
„ ix. 29, I. 379.
„ x. 1, I. 379.

1 Chronicles xxi. 11, I. 295.

2 Chronicles x. 16, I. 372.
„ xvii. 6, I. 380.
„ xx. 33, I. 380.
„ xxii. 2, I. 409, 410.

Nehemiah viii. 8, I. 225.
„ xiii. 2, 4, I. 225.

Psalms xvi. 1, I. 394-397.
„ xviii. 8, I. 443.
„ xxii. 17, I. 404-408.
„ xxv. I. 389-393.
„ xl. 7-9, I. 312.
„ xlviii. 15, I. 67.
„ lv. 16, I. 67.
„ c. 3, I. 373.
„ cxlv. I. 393-394.

Proverbs xviii. 22, I. 430.

Cauticles viii. 6, I. 131.

Isaiah ix. 2, I. 372.
„ xix. 8, I. 444-446.
„ xix. 18, I. 8.
„ xxv. 1, I. 67.
„ liii. 8, I. 443-444.
„ lviii. 10, I. 431.

Jeremiah li. 19, I. 292-293.

Amos ix. 11, 12, I. 312.

Micah v. 2, I. 310, 311.

Zechariah ix. 9, I. 313.
„ xii. 10, I. 417.

Malachi iii. 1, I. 311.

Matthew ii. 6, I. 310-311.
„ v. 8, I. 30.
„ vi. 13, II. 427-432.
Matthew ix. 36, II. 377.
„ xix. 17, II. 432-437.
„ xxi. 5, II. 313.
„ xxi. 28-31, II. 434-436.
„ xxvii. 35, 36, II. 436, 437.

Luke xxii. 43, 44, II. 437-439.

Acts viii. 37, II. 439, 440.
„ xv. 16, 17, I. 312.
„ xv. 20, 29, II. 373.
„ xx. 28, II. 441-448.
„ xxii. 25-28, I. 311, 312.

Romans vii. 6, II. 375.
„ xi. 6, II. 378.

1 Corinthians v. 8, II. 165.
„ xv. 29, II. 373.

1 Timothy, iii. 16, II. 382-402.

1 John v. 7, II. 403-426.

Revelation xxii. 14, II. 378.

II. OF AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS.

Abbe de Camps, II. 307.
Abraham Ben Chayim's Hebrew Bible referred to, I. 140.
Abu Said's Arabic Version of the Pentateuch, I. 258.
Accents in the Greek Testament, their late origin, II. 16, 17.
Adler, N. T. Versiones Syriacae denuo examinatae, II. 165, 183, 189, 192, 193, 194, 199, 200 ; Biblisch-kritische Reise, I. 258, 362.
Ælian's Varia Historia cited, I. 165.
Agapetus, Deacon of Constantinople, his writings referred to, II. 354.
Age of the Hebrew language, I. 13-18 ; of Hebrew MSS. 341-342.
Alcala, the library of, II. 107, 108.
Alcimus, Archbishop of Vienne, his writings referred to, II. 354.
Alcuin's revision of Jerome's Latin version, I. 271.
Aldine edition, the, of the LXX. I. 212 ; of the Greek Testament, II. 111, 112.

Alexander's, Professor, Commentary on Isaiah referred to, I. 75 ; on the Psalms, 395.
Alexandrine recension of the text of the Greek Testament, II. 72, 88.
Alexandrinus, Codex, described, II. 271-275.
Alford's Greek Testament referred to, II. 216.
Alter, Professor, his Greek Testament ii. 130 ; on the Slavonic version 239.
Ambrosiaster, (Hilary the deacon), his writings referred to, II. 354.
Ambrosius, Bishop of Milan, his writings referred to, II. 354.
Amersfoordt quoted, I. 213.
Amiatinus, Codex, described, II. 254, 255.
Ammonian-Eusebian sections, the, II. 17.
Ammonius, an Alexandrine writer, II. 339.
Amphilochius of Iconium, II. 340, 341.
Anastasius Sinaita, II. 348.
Andreas, Bishop of Caesarea, his writings referred to, II. 348.
Andreas, Archbishop of Crete, his writings, II. 349.
Antiochus, Bishop of Ptolemais in Phenicia, his writings, II. 346.
Antony, an Egyptian Monk, his Opuscula, II. 341.
Antwerp Polyglott, the, I. 145, 146 ; II. 172.
Apollinaris, the younger, his Commentaries, II. 341.
Apostolic Canons, the, II. 339.
Apostolic Constitutions, the, II. 339.
Apostolical Fathers, their mode of quoting the New Testament, II. 44, 45.
Ἀπόστολος, ὁ, explained, II. 32.
Aquila, his Greek version of the Old Testament, I. 215-217.
Arabic versions of the Old Testament, I. 255-260.
Arabic versions and editions of the New Testament, II. 222-229.
Aramæan language, the, I. 12.
Archelaus, a Mesopotamian bishop, his writings referred to, II. 339.
Arethas, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, his works, II. 351.
Argenteus, Codex, described, II. 232-234.
Aristeas, his account of the origin of the Septuagint, I. 166, &c.
Aristobulus, his testimony respecting the Septuagint, I. 163-164.
Arius, his Letter to Eusebius referred to, II. 341.
Armenian version of the New Testament, the, II. 215-220.
Arnobius, his writings referred to, II. 355.
Assemani, J. S., referred to, I. 243 ; II. 164, 188, 195.
Asterius of Cappadocia, II. 341.
Athanasius, his writings referred to, II. 340 ; quoted, 395, 442, 445.
Athenagoras, II. 338.
Athias, his edition of the Hebrew Bible, I. 147.
Aubert's edition of Cyril, II. 386.
Augiensis, Codex, II. 298.
Augustine, on the early Latin version, I. 262, 267 ; II. 241, 243 ; his works referred to, 355.
Auriville's Dissertationes ad Sacras litteras et philol. Orient. pertinentes cited, I. 396.

Autographs of the New Testament writers, II. 39-42.
Aymon, John, referred to, II. 291.

Baba Bathra quoted, I. 104.
Babylonian Talmud quoted, I. 20, 21.
Bacon, Roger, referred to, I. 272, 273.
Bahrdt referred to, I. 207.
Baldwin the Jesuit referred to, I. 280.
Barberinian Triglott referred to, I. 258.
Barcochab, coins restruck by, I. 35.
Bardesanes referred to, I. 245, 246.
Bar Hebraeus, Gregory, quoted, I. 245, 251, 252 ; II. 187, 216.
Barnabas, II. 42 ; epistle of, 337 ; quoted, 389.
Barrett, Dr., of Trin. Col. Dub., his Fac-simile of the Codex Rescriptus Dublinensis described, II. 311-313.
Basil, Bishop of Seleucia, his Orations referred to, II. 346.
Basil, the great, II. 341 ; quoted, 389, 442.
Bayer, de numis Hebraeo-Samaritanis, quoted, I. 35.
Bauer referred to, I. 260.
Bede, his writings referred to, II. 355.
Bellarmine's Preface to the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, I. 278, 279, 281.
Bengel, John Albert, his edition of the Greek Testament, II. 123, 124; Introductio ad Crisin, 370; Gnomon, 429, 430.
Bentley, I. 262; quoted, II. 257, 259.
Benzelius, Archb. of Upsal, referred to, II. 231, 233.
Bernstein referred to, II. 187; De Charklensi Nov. Test. translatione Syriaca Commentatio, 188.
Bertholdt's Einleitung referred to, II. 186.
Beza's editions of the Greek Testament, II. 115, 116; referred to, 306, &c.
Bible, Hebrew, the first printed edition of, I. 140; various succeeding editions of, 140-161.
Biblical Review, II. 108.
Bibliothecae Barberinae, Codex, II. 311.
Bibliotheca Sacra referred to, I. 408.
Bibliotheca Sussexiana, by Pettigrew, I. 347.
Birch, his edition of the Four Gospels, II. 130, 276; referred to, 441.
Blanchini and Hwid's Specimen ineditae versionis Arabico-Samaritanae Pentateuchi, I. 259.
Blanchini, Evangeliarium Quadruplex latinae versionis antiquae seu veteris Italicae, II. 242, 252, 253, 276, 296.
Bobbiensis, Codex, II. 246, 247.
Bochart, quoted, I. 402.
Bode referred to, II. 205.
Boecler's edition of the Greek Testament, II. 119.
Boernerianus, Codex, II. 247.
Bomberg's Rabbinical Bibles, I. 121, 129, 131, 142, 143-145.

Boothroyd's Hebrew Bible, I. 158, 159, 412, 413.
Boreel, John Andrew, referred to, II. 297.
Borecli, Codex, II. 296.
Borgianus, Codex, II. 309.
Bornemann's Acta Apostolorum Luca conscripta ad fidem Codicis Cantabrigiensis, &c. II. 288.
Bosworth, the Rev. F., I. 53.
Bowring, Dr., quoted, II., 107, 108.
Bowyer's Greek Testament, II. 127, 372.
Breithaupt referred to, I. 403.
Brixianus, Codex, II. 245.
Bruns referred to, I. 318; II. 172.
Buchanan, Dr. C., referred to, I. 369.
Bukentop the monk, I. 282.
Bull, the Papal, respecting the Latin Vulgate, I. 277.
Bunsen, quoted, I. 14, 24, 78, 87.
Burgess, Bishop, referred to, II. 407, 425.
Burton's Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, II. 445.
Buxtorf the younger, on the Hebrew characters, I. 22; De Punctorum &c. in libris V. T. origine, 53.
Buxtorf, the elder, his Tiberias, I. 104, 116; his Hebrew and Rabbinical Bibles, 146, 147.

Caesareus Vindobonensis, Codex, II. 307.
Caesarius of Arles, his writings referred to, II. 355.
Caesarius, brother of G. Nazianzenus, his dialogues referred to, II. 341; quoted, 429.
Calecas, Manuel, quoted, II. 423.
Calligraphical and tachygraphical writing, I. 28, 29.
Calvin, quoted, II. 427, 428.
Canon of the Old Testament, I. 103-108.
Canon of the New Testament, II. 30-38.
Canons or rules of Criticism, I. 386-387; II. 374-381.
Cantabrigiensis or Bezae, Codex, II. 246, 285-288.
Cappellus, his Arcanum Punctationis revelatum, I. 53; Critica Sacra, 116, 117, 125, 297, 299.
Carlyle, Prof., referred to, II. 228.
Carpzov quoted, I. 420.
Cassian, his writings, referred to, II. 355.
Cassiodorus, his writings referred to, II. 356; quoted, 417.
Castell, referred to, II. 223, 226.
Cedrenus, George, his Chronicle referred to, II. 351.
Chapters, in the Hebrew Bible, the origin of, I. 60.
Chapters and Verses in the Greek Testament, their origin, II. 21.
Charlemagne referred to, I. 270.

Chayim, Rabbi Ben, referred to, I. 142, 144, 427.
Chifflet's Vigilii Tapsensis Vindiciae, referred to, II. 418.
China, account of the Hebrew MSS. found in, I. 367-369.
Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, II. 356.
Chrysocephalus, his writings referred to, II. 353.
Chrysostom quoted, I. 6, 7 ; II. 202, 215, 388, 442 ; his works generally, 345.
Cilicisms, the supposed, of Paul's writings, II. 11.
Clarke, Dr. Adam, referred to, II. 408.
Claromontanus, Codex, II. 245, 288-292.
Classification of Hebrew MSS. I. 344, 345 ; of the MSS. of the Greek Testament, II. 88-105.
Claudius, Bishop of Turin, his writings referred to, II. 356.
Clementine and Sixtine editions of the Vulgate, the, I. 278-283.
Clement of Alexandria referred to, II. 19, 46 ; his writings, 338 ; quoted, 387.
Clement of Rome, referred to, II. 42, 335.
Codices, Latin, II. 244-248, 255, 256; Greek, 271-327.
Coin-writing, Jewish, I. 23, 25.
Coislinianus, Codex, II. 297, 302.
Colbertinus, Codex, II. 246.
Coleman, the Rev. Mr., of Ventnor, referred to, I. 369.
Colinæus, his edition of the Greek Testament, II. 112.
Columbanus, his writings referred to, II. 356.
Complutensian Polyglott, referred to or described, I. 141, 142, 211 ; the Greek Testament in the, II. 106, 107, 420.
Constantinopolitan Recension of the Text of the Greek Testament, II. 73, 89.
Corbejensis, Codex, II. 245, 247.
Correctoria or Epanorthotae, what, I. 272, 273.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, referred to, II. 195 ; his writings, 349.
Cramer's Beiträge referred to, II. 208.
Credner, De Prophetarum Minorum Versionis Syriacae quam Peschito Vocant indole, I. 249.
Critical application of ancient versions, I. 285-293.
Critical conjecture, its use, I. 374-381 ; II. 371-383.
Critical rules for determining various readings, II. 374-381.
C'thibs and k'ris, what, I. 122-124.
C'thib v'lo k'ri, what, I. 125.
Curcellaeus, his edition of the Greek Text, II. 119.
Cureton's edition of the Syriac Gospels, II. 431
Cursive MSS. II. 262 ; described, 318-324.
Custodes linearum, I. 67, 68.
Cyprian, quoted, II. 59, 60, 412, 413 ; his writings, 356.
Cyprius, Codex, II. 304.
Cyril of Alexandria, II. 346 ; quoted, 385, 386.

Cyril of Jerusalem, his writings referred to, II. 341.
Cyril and Methodius, translators of the Slavonic version of the New Testament, II. 238.

D'Allemand, Judah, revised Van der Hooght's Hebrew Bible, I. 159.
Dathe referred to, I. 247.
Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics, I. 399, 419.
De Dieu referred to, II. 174.
Demetrius Phalereus, I. 164-166.
Demidovianus, Codex, II. 256.
Derrer, his transcript of the Gothic version from the Codex Argenteus II. 230.
De Rossi, his Annales Hebraeo-typographici, and de Hebraicae typographiae origine, &c. I. 138, 139, 140, 141 ; de ignotis nonnullis antiquissimis Hebr. text. editionibus, 139 ; his Scholia Critica on the Hebrew Bible, 155-157, 397, 428.
De Sacy's Memoire sur l'état actuel des Samaritains, I. 242.
De Wette's Einleitungen, I. 119 ; II. 19, 159, 162, 235.
Diadochus of Photice, his writings referred to, II. 347.
Dialect, the New Testament, II. 2-19.
Dialects of the Hebrew language, I. 18, 19.
Didymus of Alexandria, his writings, II. 341, 342 ; quoted, 389, 394
Diodorus of Tarsus, quoted, I. 6 ; his writings referred to, II. 342.
Diognetus, the Epistle to, quoted, II. 389.
Dionysius Bar Salibi, referred to, II. 195.
Dionysius of Alexandria, his writings, II. 339 ; quoted, 393.
Dionysius of Corinth quoted, II. 46.
Dobrovsky's Slavanca, II. 239, 240.
Documents of the Greek Testament, classification of, II. 88-105.
Doederlein and Meisner's Hebrew Bible, I. 158.
Dorotheus of Tyre, his works referred to, II. 342.
Dublinensis, Codex, II. 311-313.

Eber referred to, I. 8.
Ecclesiastical element in the Greek of the New Testament, II. 11, 12.
Eckhel's Doctrina Numorum Veterum, I. 35.
Egyptian Versions of the New Testament, II. 206-214.
Eichhorn's Einleitungen, I. 130, 132, 211, &c. ; II. 54, 55, 161, 205, 207, 217, 218.
Elias of Crete, his writings referred to, II. 350.
Elzevir editions of the Greek Testament, II. 117.
Emmerami, Codex, II. 256.
Engelbreth referred to, II. 213.
Enneapla, the, of Origen, I. 204.
Ephraem, the Syrian, referred to, I. 244, 248 251 ; II. 153 ; his writings, 342.

Ephraemi, Codex, described, II. 281-285.
Epiphanius on the origin of the Septuagint, I. 168 ; referred to or quoted, 217 ; II. 49, 50, 438 ; his writings referred to, 342.
Epiphanius Scholasticus, his writings, II. 356.
Erasmus, his Greek Testament, various editions of, II. 108-110 ; referred 419, 420.
Erpenius, his edition of the Arabic Pentateuch, I. 257 ; of the Arabic version of the Gospels, II. 223, 225.
Estienne, Robert (Stephens), his editions of the Vulgate, I. 274.
Estrangelo, meaning of the term, I. 243.
Æthiopic version of the New Testament, II. 202-206.
Εὐαγγέλιον, what, II. 32.
Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, his writings referred to, II. 356 ; quoted, 414, 415.
Eugenius, Confession drawn up by, II. 416.
Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, his writings, II. 349.
Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, his works, II. 342, 343.
Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa, his writings referred to, II. 343.
Eustathius, Patriarch of Antioch, II. 343.
Euthalius referred to, II. 19 ; his writings, 346, 394.
Eutherius of Tyanea, his writings referred to, II. 346.
Euthymius Zygabenus, his writings referred to, II. 352, 429.
Evagrius, the Nitrian Monk, referred to, II. 343.
Evangeliarium, what, II. 20.
Ewald's Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, I. 15, 31, 43, 44 ; on the Assyrian-Hebrew Vocalisation, 45, 46.
Eznak, author of the Armenian version of the New Testament, II. 215.

Fabricius, Guido, his edition of the Peshito Syriac New Testament, II. 172.
Fac-similes of the Hebrew MSS. obtained at the Synagogue of K'ae-fung-foo referred to, I. 368.
Facundus, an African Bishop, his writings referred to, II. 357, 413, 414.
Fagi, referred to, I. 231.
Fastidius, a British Bishop, II. 356.
Fathers, and other early Christian writers who have quoted the New Testament, Greek, II. 335-353 ; Latin, 354-362.
Faustinus, Presbyter of Rome, his writings, II. 357.
Faustus, the Manichaean, his works, II. 357.
Fell, Bishop, his edition of the Greek Text, II. 119, 120.
Flaminius Nobilius referred to, I. 263.
Fleck, II. 284.
Ford's Appendix ad editionem Novi Testamenti Græci e Codice MS. Alexandrino a Car. God. Woide descripti, &c. II. 279.
Forojuliensis, Codex, II. 256.
Fossatensis, Codex, II. 256.

Frankel's Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta referred to, I. 111, 177, 179, 187, 198, 199, *et al.*
Frommanni Opuscula I. 314.
Frumentius referred to, II. 203.
Fuldensis, Codex, II. 255.
Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe, his writings, II. 357; quoted, 414, 415, 416.

Gabelentz, H. C. de, editor of the Gothic version of the New Testament, II. 232, 236.
Gabler referred to, II. 441.
Gabriel Sionita, I. 253; his edition of the Arabic version of the Gospels, II. 223.
Gallandii Bibliotheca referred to, II. 343, 344, 345, *et al.*
Gardie, Count de la, referred to, II. 233.
Gatiani, Codex, II. 256.
Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, his writings, II. 357.
Geddes referred to, I. 413, 414, 415.
Gelasius of Cyzicus, his writings, II. 346.
Gelasius, Pope, the Council held under him, quoted, II. 77.
Gemaras, the two, I. 115, 315.
Genealogies, antediluvian and postdiluvian, according to the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint Pentateuch, I. 85.
Gennadius referred to, II. 346.
Georgi, II. 207, 208, 213, 309.
Georgian version of the New Testament, II. 221.
Gerhard of Maestricht, his edition of the Greek Testament, II. 122.
Gerson's Hebrew Bible, I. 141.
Gesenius, his Hebrew Grammar, I. 8, 12; Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, 9, 13, 14, 225; on the change of Hebrew characters, 22, 23, 30; De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole, et auctoritate, 79, 94, 95, 186, *et al;* Lehrgebäude, 119; Commentar ueber den Jesaia, 233.
Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, II. 343.
Gildas referred to, II. 357.
Gill, Dr. John, I. 315.
Glycas, a Byzantine Historian, his writings, II. 352.
Golden and Silver Ages of the Hebrew language, I. 16-18.
Gothic Version of the New Testament, the, II. 230-237.
Gottschalk, II. 301.
Grabe, his edition of the LXX., I. 212.
Grammatical peculiarities of the New Testament dialect, II. 9.
Greenfield's edition of the Peshito Syriac New Testament, II. 181-183.
Gregorius Palamas, his writings, II. 353.
Gregory Bar Hebraeus cited, I. 245, 251, 252.
Gregory the Great, Pope, referred to, I. 269; his writings, II. 357.

Gregory of Nazianzum, his writings, II. 342.
Gregory of Nyssa, his writings, II. 342 ; quoted, 389, 396, 428.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, his writings, II. 340 ; quoted, 396.
Griesbach, his Opuscula Academica referred to, II. 40, 41 ; system of recensions, 72-75 ; editions of his Greek Testament, 127-128, 131, 132, 133, 134 ; Symbolæ Criticæ, 128, 295, 299, 305 ; Dissert. crit. de cod. quat. evang. orig. 368, 369 ; Commentarius Criticus, II. 434.
Grinfield's Apology for the LXX., I. 194, 195.
Grotius quoted, I. 6.
Guelpherbytanus, Codex of the Latin version, II. 247.
Guelpherbytani, Codices, Greek, II. 308.
Gutbier's edition of the Peshito Syr. New Testament, II. 175.

Hagiographa, Targums on the, I. 237, 238.
Hahn's edition of the Hebrew Bible, I. 159 ; Das Evangelium Marcion's u. s. w., II. 336.
Hai, Rabbi, referred to, I. 426.
Haitho, King of Armenia, referred to, II. 216, 217.
Hamilton's Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures, I. 191.
Haphtaroth, the, I. 59.
Harclea, or Harkel, Thomas of, his revision of the Philoxenian version of the New Testament, II. 186-190.
Harwood's Greek Testament, II. 128, 373.
Harlejanus, Codex, II. 256.
Hassencamp's commentatio philologica-critica, de Pentateucho LXX. interpretum graeco, non ex Hebraeo sed. Samaritano textu converso, referred to, I. 184.
Havemann's Wegeleuchte wieder die Jüdische Finsternissen, I. 228.
Hävernick, his Einleitung referred to, I. 7, 13, 104.
Hebraisms in the Greek Testament, II. 9-11.
Hebrew, meaning of the term, I. 6-9 ; when first used, 9.
Hebrew characters, I. 20-36.
Hebrew language, I. 6-19.
Hebrew MSS. ; Synagogue Rolls, I. 321-324 ; private, 324-336 ; country, age, goodness, &c., 336-344 ; classification of, 344 ; in Rabbinical characters, 345 ; description of several, 346-365 ; in China, 366-370 ; application to criticism, 370-373.
Hebrew vowels, I. 37-55.
Henderson, Dr., quoted, II. 384, 390, 392.
Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms quoted, I. 74, 302, 391 ; Dissertations on the Pentateuch, 100, 104, 225 ; Christologie, 397.
Hentenius, John, his edition of the Vulgate, I. 274.
Heracleon the Valentinian referred to, II. 336.
Herbst's Historisch-kritische Einleitung, &c. I. 31, 77, 98, 103, 249, *et al.*
Heringa, Professor, referred to, II. 297.

Hesychius, referred to, I. 208 ; his recension of the Greek Testament, II. 76-78 ; his writings referred to, 343.
Hexapla, the, of Origen described, I. 202-203.
Hieronymus, see Jerome.
Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, his writings, II. 358, 438.
Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, his writings, II. 358.
Hippolytus of Antioch, his writings, II. 340 ; quoted 395.
Hirt's Oriental. und Exegetisch. Bibliothek, II. 169.
Hirzel, De Pentateuchi Versionis Syriacae quam Pesehito vocant indole, I. 247, 249.
History of the Text of the Old Testament, I. 56-161.
History of the Text of the New Testament, II. 13-149.
Hody, De Bibliorum textibus, &c. I. 164, 174, 177, 178.
Hoffmann's Grammatica Syriaca, I. 244.
Holmes's edition of the Septuagint, I. 201, 213.
Höpfner's Exegetisches Handbuch, I. 402.
Horne, T. H., referred to, I. 270.
Horsley's Biblical Criticism, I. 399.
Houbigant's (C. F.), his Hebrew Bible, I. 149-150 ; referred to, 304, 305.
Hug, his Einleitung, I. 246 ; II. 65, 113, 153, 155, 164, 200, 204, 207, 234 ; on the Clementine and Sixtine editions of the Vulgate, I. 279 ; De Antiquitate Codicis Vaticani, II. 276.
Hugo, A. St. Caro, I. 272.
Hunerich, King of the Vandals, referred to, II. 416.
Hupfeld, Studien und Kritiken, I. 24 ; Hebräische Grammatik, I. 27, 42.
Hurwitz, revised Van der Hooght's Hebrew Bible, I. 159.
Hutter, Elias, his edition of the Hebrew Bible, I. 146 ; of the New Testament in twelve languages, II. 173.

Ibas, quoted, II. 443, 444.
Ibrahim of Haleb, referred to, I. 255.
Ignatius, referred to or quoted, II. 40, 42, 335, 395.
Ignatius, Patriarch of the Maronites, II. 167.
Ihre, John, referred to, II. 231, 233.
Ingoldstadiensis, Codex, II. 256.
Irenaeus on the Hebrew letters, I. 33 ; respecting Aquila, 217 ; his works referred to, II. 335, 336, quoted, 46.
Isaac, the Armenian Patriarch, referred to, II. 215.
Isidore Clarius, his edition of the Latin Bible, I. 275.
Isidore of Pelusium, his writings, II. 346.
Isidore of Seville, quoted, I. 270.
Itala Vetus, the, I. 261-264 ; II. 243.

Jablonski's Hebrew Bible, I. 148.
Jacob Ben Chayim, I. 121, 129, 132.
Jacob of Edessa referred to, I. 245.

Jacob, Rabbi, son of Tawus, his Persian version of the Pentateuch, I. 260.
Jacobus of Nisibis, his writings, II. 358.
Jahn's Hebrew Bible, referred to, I. 84 ; described, 158 ; Hebrew Commonwealth, 106 ; Einleitung, 57.
James's Bellum Papale, I. 278, 280.
Jarchi, referred to, I. 317.
Jerome, on the changes of the Hebrew letters, I. 21 ; on Hebrew vocalization in his day, 50-52 ; on the alleged falsification of the Hebrew Scriptures by the Jews, 70 ; on the Septuagint, 181, 202 ; on Aquila's version, 216, 219 ; on the Latin versions of his time, 262, 264, 265, 266, 267 ; his own version, 264, 270 ; on the New Testament mode of quotation from the Old Testament, 310 ; on the supposed Cilicisms in Paul's writings, II. 11 ; charge against Marcion, 49 ; revision of the old Latin, 249 ; his writings generally, 357, 358 ; quoted or referred to, 77, 97, 241, 249, 250, 251, 438.
Jerusalem Targum, the, I. 236.
Jesudad, B. Von Hadath, referred to, I. 245.
Jesus, the Son of Sirach, I. 106 ; his supposed testimony to the LXX., 166.
Jewish element in the diction of the Greek Testament, II. 9-11.
Jews at K'ae-fung-foo the, I. 368.
Johannes Damascenus, his works, II. 350.
John, Bishop of Seville, referred to, II. 224.
Jonathan, the Targum of, I. 232 ; the Pseudo-Jonathan, 234.
Josephus referred to, I. 104, 105, 167.
Jost's Geschichte der Israeliten referred to, I. 256.
Julius Firmicus Maternus, his writings, II. 357.
Junius, Francis, his edition of the Gothic version of the Gospels, II. 230.
Justin Martyr on the origin of the Septuagint, I. 168, 195 ; his mode of quoting the New Testament, II. 44 ; his writings, 335.
Justinian quoted, I. 196.
Justiniani, on Psalm xxii. 17, quoted, I. 407.
Juvencus of Spain, his writings, II. 358.
Juynboll's Commentarii in historiam gentis Samaritani referred to, I. 96 ; Letterkündige Bijdragen, II. 224.

Kalkar, referred to, I. 96.
Karkaphensian recension of the Peshito, I. 252.
Karshuni New Testament, the, II. 224, 226.
Kaye, Bishop, his history of the 2d and 3d centuries, II. 411.
Kennicott referred to, I. 107, 133, 139 ; his Hebrew Bible, 152-155 ; Dissertations on the state of the printed Hebrew text, 107, 133, 139, 398, 399, 410, 412, 430 ; dissertatio generalis, 136, 140 ; his ten annual accounts, 140.
Κεφάλαια, II. 17.
Kidd's Tracts, &c. of Porson, II. 402.

Kimchi referred to, I. 317, 427.
Kipling referred to, II. 286, 287, 288.
Kirsch's reprint of the Syriac Pentateuch, I. 254.
Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature referred to, II. 22; Journal of Sacred Literature, 142, 144, 319, 323.
Knittel, F. A., referred to, II. 231, 308.
Knobel's Der Prophet Jesaia, I. 443.
Kopitar on the Slavic language, II. 238.
Kopp on the change of the Hebrew letters, I. 23, 24.
K'ris and c'thibs, I. 122-124.
K'ri, v'lo c'thib, I. 125.
Kuinoel referred to, II. 441.
Küster, Ludolph, his edition of Mill's Greek Testament, II. 122, 301.

Lachmann referred to, II. 103, 104; his editions of the Greek Testament, 139, 143, 243.
La Croze's Thesaurus, II. 218.
Lactantius, his writings referred to, II. 358.
Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, referred to, I. 272.
Language, Hebrew, nature of the, I. 6-19.
Language of the New Testament, II. 1-12.
Latin, see versions and MSS.
Laudianus, Codex, II. 246, 293.
Laurence referred to, II. 75, 103; on 1 John v. 7, 384, 385, 391.
Lectionarium, what, II. 20.
Lee, Prof., his Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta, I. 187; quoted, 253, 254; II. 165, 176, 178, 179, 226; his edition of the Syriac Old Testament, I. 253, 254; his Syriac Testament, II. 178-181.
Lee, Archbishop of York, II. 419.
Le Fevre, his edition of the Peshito New Testament, II. 173.
Le Long's Bibliotheca, quoted, I. 150, 159; referred to, II. 113.
Leo the Great, Pope, his writings, II. 358.
Leontius of Byzantium, his writings, II. 349.
Lexical peculiarities of the New Testament dialect, II. 7-9.
Liberatus, Archdeacon of Carthage, his writings, II. 359.
Lindanus referred to, I. 272.
Loebe, Dr. J., his edition of the Gothic version of the New Testament, II. 232, 236.
Loescher, De Causis linguae Hebraeae, I. 22; referred to, 13.
Loehlein, his Syrus Epistolae ad Ephesios interpres referred to, II. 159, 166, 167.
Lorsbach referred to, I. 260.
Lowth, Bishop, referred to, I. 304, 305.
Lucian, Presb. of Antioch, referred to, I. 207; recension of the Greek Testament, II. 76, 78, 79.
Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, his writings, II. 359.

Ludolph's Historia Æthiopica, and Commentarius in histor. Æthiop., II. 203, 205.
Luther omits 1 John v. 7 in his version ; II. 406.
Luxoviensis, Codex, II. 256.
Luzzatto, S. D., referred to, I. 46 ; his Philoxenus, sive de Onkelosi Chaldaica Pentateuchi versione dissertatio hermeneutico-critica, 231.
Macarius, an Egyptian Monk, his writings, II. 343.
Mace, his edition of the Greek Testament, II. 123.
Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, his writings, II. 349 ; referred to, 389, 395.
Madden's (Sir F.), Alcuine's Bible in the British Museum, referred to, I. 272.
Mai, Cardinal Angelo, referred to, II. 231, 245, 280.
Maimonides quoted, I. 226 ; referred to, 317, 318.
Marchand, Prosper, referred to, I. 280.
Marcion referred to, II. 31, 32 ; charged with corrupting the sacred text of the New Testament, 47-53 ; his works, 336.
Marcus Diadochus, his writings, II. 346.
Marsh, Bishop, his Lectures on the Criticism, &c. of the New Testament, referred to, I. 271 ; II. 418, 419 ; his edition of Michaelis, II. 19, 81, 150, 170, 175, 226, 286.
Marshall, Thomas, referred to, II. 230.
Martin the First, Bishop of Rome, his works, II. 359.
Masch's Le Long referred to, I. 150, 159.
Masorah, what, I. 119-128 ; value of, 128.
Masoretes, who, I. 120, 126.
Matthaei, Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen welche der Herr Abt. Bengel, &c. II. 85 ; his Greek Testament, 129, 130.
Maurer's Commentarius Criticus quoted, I. 402.
Maximus of Chrysopolis, his writings, II. 349.
Maximus, Bishop of Turin, his Homilies referred to, II. 359.
Meletius of Antioch, his writings, II. 344.
Melito, referred to, I. 246.
Memphitic version of the New Testament, II. 209-214.
Menachem de Lonzano, Rabbi, his critical labours on the Pentateuch, I. 152.
Menologium, what, II. 20.
Mercator, Marius, his works, II. 359.
Metaphrastes, Simeon, referred to, II. 234.
Methodius, Bishop of Tyre, referred to, II. 340.
Meyer Hallevi of Toledo, referred to, I. 136.
Michaelis, C. B. De Variis N. T. lectionibus, II. 204, 370.
Michaelis, J. H., his Hebrew Bible, I. 150.
Michaelis, Sir J. D., his Introduction, I. 246 ; II. 80, 81, 447 ; Curae in versionem Syriacam Actuum Apostolorum, 161, 163, 167.

Michael Psellus, Senator of Constantinople, his writings, II. 351.
Middleton on the Greek Article, referred to, II. 425.
Miesrob, II. 215.
Mill, II. 110 ; his Greek Testament, 121, 122, 252.
Mingarelli referred to, II. 208.
Mishna, the, I. 115.
Moldenhauer referred to, II. 108, 130.
Monacensis, Codex, II. 310.
Montfaucon, his edition of the Hexapla, I. 205, 207, 218 ; Palæographia Græca, II. 264, 266, 267 ; Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum, 276.
Monthly Repository referred to, II. 107.
Morin, S. De Lingua Primeva, quoted, I. 13, 22 ; John, his opinion of the Vulgate, 283 ; Exercitationes in Utrumque Samarit. Pentateuch, 362.
Moses Ben Simeon's Rabbinical Bible, I. 147.
Moses of Chorene, or Chorenensis, referred to, I. 246 ; Historia Armeniaca, II. 215.
Moses of Mardin referred to, II. 167, 170.
Mosquenses, Codd. II. 307, 309.
MSS. of the Hebrew Bible, I. ; Synagogue copies, 321-324 ; private, 324 ; character of the letters of, 326 ; country of, 337-340; the age of, 341-343 ; goodness, 343 ; classification of, 344-345 ; in Rabbinical characters, 345 ; description of several, 346-362 ; found in China, 366-370 ; observations on, 370-373.
MSS. Samaritan, I. 362-365.
MSS. of the Greek Testament, division and materials of, II. 262-270 ; Uncial, 271-317 ; Cursive, 318-324 ; Evangelistaria and lectionaria, 325-327 ; observations on, 328-334 ; classification of, 88-105.
MSS. of the Latin version, II. 244-248.
Munster, Sebastian, his Hebrew Bible, I. 147.
Münter referred to, II. 208, 210, 211 ; Fragmenta versionis antiquae latinae ante-Hieronym. Prophetarum, &c. I. 264.
Muralt's Greek Testament, II. 145 ; 240 ; Catalog. Codd. Bibliothecae Imperialis publicae Graec. et Lat. 296.
Mutinensis, Codex, II. 302.

Nanianus, Codex, II. 309.
Neapolitanus, Codex, II. 308.
Nesjulamam referred to, II. 225.
Nestorius of Constantinople, his writings, II. 347 ; quoted, 389.
New Testament, the language of, II. 1-12.
Newton, Sir Isaac, on 1 John v. 7 ; II. 426.
Nicolaus, Cardinal, referred to, I. 272.
Nicholson, Dr., quoted, I. 10, 14.
Nilus of Constantinople, his writings, II. 347.
Nissel's Hebrew Bible, I. 146.
Nonnus of Egypt, his works, II. 347.

Norton, Andrews, on the pure transmission of the text of the New Testament, II. 148-149.
Norzi, Salomon, his critical commentary on the Hebrew Bible, I. 151, 409.
Novatian, a Presbyter of Rome, his writings, II. 359.

Observations on the use of ancient versions, II. 258-261 ; on quotations from the New Testament in early Christian writers, 362-370.
Occidental recension of the Greek Text, II. 72.
Odessa MSS., the, I. 357.
Ὁ Ἑβραῖος, what, I. 221.
Œcumenius, his writings, II. 351.
Old Testament Books, their age, I. 15 ; history of the text of, external form, 56-63 ; of the text itself till the close of the canon, 64-108 ; till the destruction of Jerusalem, 109-111 ; till the establishment of the Masoretic text, 112-134 ; till part of the Bible first appeared in print, 135, 136 ; of the printed text, 137-161 ; division and number of books, 56 ; divisions in the text, 63.
Onkelos, the Targum of, I. 229-231.
Opitius, his Hebrew Bible, I. 148.
Optatus, Bishop of Milevi, his writings, II. 360.
Oriental Christian Spectator referred to, I. 255.
Origen on the change of the Hebrew letters, I. 21 ; Epist. ad Africanum, 200 ; Tetrapla, 201 ; Hexapla, Octapla, and Enneapla, 202 ; blames Marcion, II. 51 ; on the corruption of the New Testament text, 61 ; various readings of the N. T. in his writings, 62-64 ; his recension of the Greek Testament, 76, 78, 79 ; quotations from the N. Test. in his writings, 338, 339 ; quoted, 387.
Orosius, a Spanish presbyter, his writings, II. 360.
Osiander, Luke, his edition of the Latin Bible, I. 275.
Owen, Dr. Henry, his enquiry into the present state of the Septuagint, I. 198, 218 ; modes of quotation used by the evangelical writers, &c., 311, 417.

Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona, his writings, II. 360.
Pagninus referred to, I. 63.
Palatinus Vindobonensis, Codex, II. 245.
Pamphilus of Cæsarea, his writings referred to, II. 344.
Parallels or repeated passages of Scripture, I. 294-307.
Paris Polyglott, the Peshito in, II. 174.
Parshioth, I. 59.
Parsons' and Holmes' edition of the Septuagint, I. 213.
Paschal Chronicle, the, referred to, II. 350.
Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, his works, II. 360.
Paulus, his edition of Saadias' Arabic translation of Isaiah I. 256.
Peculiarities of the Greek diction of the New Testament, II. 7-9.
Pelagius, his works referred to, II. 360.

Platt, T. P., his edition of the Æthiopic New Testament, II. 206.
Penn, his Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, quoted, II. 85, 279.
Pentateuch, the Hebrew, first printed, I. 138.
Pentateuch, the Samaritan, I. 78-103.
Persian versions of the Old Testament, I. 260 ; of the New, II. 221.
Peshito, meaning of the term, I. 244.
Peshito Syriac version of the Old Testament, I. 243, &c. ; its age, 244-246 ; its author, 247 ; made from the Hebrew, 248 ; influence of the LXX. on it, 248, 249 ; influence of the Targums upon it, 250 ; did not contain the Apocrypha, 251 ; its dialect, 251 ; recensions of, 252 ; printed editions of, 252-254.
Peshito Syriac version of the New Testament, II. 58-60, 150-184.
Pesukim, I. 61.
Petermann, De duabus Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus Chaldaicis, I. 235 ; referred to, II. 221.
Petrus of Alexandria, his writings, II. 340.
Pettigrew's Bibliotheca Sussexiana, I. 347.
Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, his writings, II. 360.
Philentolos, Daniel, referred to, II. 229.
Philo, on the origin of the Septuagint, I. 167-168.
Philo of Carpathus, his writings, II. 347.
Philoxenian-Syriac version of the New Testament, II. 185-194.
Philoxenus, II. 185.
Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, his writings, II. 351.
Phoebadius of Agen, his writings, II. 360 ; quoted, 414.
Plantin editions of the Greek Testament, II. 111 ; edition of the Peshito, 172, 173.
Plüschke's Lectiones Alexandrinae et Hebraicae referred to, I. 411.
Plutarch's Regum et imperator. Apophthem, I. 165.
Pierson and Wheloc's edition of the Persian version of the gospels, II. 221, 222.
Pinner's Prospectus der der Odessaer Gesellschaft fur geschichte und Alterthümer gehörenden ältesten hebräischen und rabbinischen Manuscripte, referred to, I. 46, 358 ; MSS. described by, 357-362.
Pirke Aboth referred to, I. 104.
Pius IV. and V., Popes, their labours on the Vulgate, I. 276, 277.
Pococke's Epistolae Quatuor, Petri secunda, &c. II. 195.
Polycarp referred to, II. 43 ; epistle respecting the Martyrdom of, 337.
Polyglott, the Antwerp, II. 172 ; the Paris, 174 ; the London, 174.
Porphyry referred to, II. 340.
Porson's Letters to Archd. Travis referred to, I. 271 ; II. 375 ; quoted, 407, 408, 426.
Πραξαπόστολος, II. 20.
Primasius, an African Bishop, his writings, II. 360.
Primitive language, the, I. 13-15.
Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople, his writings, II. 347.
Procopius of Gaza, his Commentaries, II. 349.

Prosper of Aquitain, referred to, II. 361.
Prudentius of Spain, his writings referred to, II. 361.
Psalter, the Hebrew, first printed, I. 137.
Ptolemy Philadelphus and Ptolemy Lagi, their connection with the LXX. I. 164, 165, 170-174.
Ptolemy, the Gnostic, II. 337, 338.
Punctuation, the, of the Greek Testament, II. 16.

Quatremere's Recherches sur la langue et la litterature de l'Egypte, II. 213.
Quotations from the Old Testament in the New, I. 308-313.
Quotations from Rabbinical writers, I. 314-320.
Quotations from the New Testament in ancient writers—Greek, II. 335 353 ; Latin, 354-362 ; Observations on, 362-370.

Rabbi Asche referred to, I. 115.
Rabbi Judah, the Holy, I. 115.
Rabbinical Writers, quotations from the Old Test. in them, I. 314-320.
Ragusio, Cardinal Johannes de, referred to, II. 293.
Raymundus, Baptista, referred to, II. 223.
Readings, various, causes of, I. 65-71 ; 288-293 ; II. 23-29.
Recensions of the Greek Testament, II. 68-87 ; Griesbach's system of, 72, &c. ; Hug's, 75-79 ; Eichhorn's, 79, 80 ; Michaelis's, 80, 81 ; Nolan's, 81 ; Scholz's, 82 ; Rinck's, 83 ; Tischendorf's, 84 ; remarks on, 88, &c.
Reiche, his Collation of Paris MSS., II. 144.
Reinke's Beitraege zur Erklärung des alten Testaments referred to, I. 75, 76, 403.
Renaudot's Liturg. Orient. collectio, II. 207.
Rettig his fac-simile of the Codex Sangallensis referred to, II. 144, 315, 316.
Reviser, the, of Hebrew MSS., I. 334.
Rhedigerianus, Codex, II. 246.
Ridley, De Syriacarum Novi Foederis Versionum indole etc., II. 185, 193, 194.
Rinck's Classification of MSS. &c. &c., in his Lucubratio Critica, II. 83, 144, 200.
Ritschl referred to, I. 165.
Rocca, Angelus, referred to, I. 277.
Roediger's Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar, I. 12, 18 ; De Origine et indole Arabicae librorum V. T. historicorum interpret. 257.
Roediger (Mauritius) Synopsis Evangeliorum, II. 432.
Roman edition of the LXX. I. 212 ; of the Peshito, II. 176.
Rosenmüller, De Versione Pentateuchi Persica Commentatio, I. 260 ; Handbuch fur die Literatur, u. s. w. II. 172.

Rossi, see De Rossi.
Routh's Reliquae Sacrae, II. 336, 339, 340.
Rueckert's Der Brief Pauli an die Ephesier erläutert und vertheidigt, II. 159.
Rufinus of Aquileia, his writings, II. 361.
Rules for the right use of ancient versions, II. 260, 261; for determining the true reading, 374-381; for the right use of the Fathers in the criticism of the sacred text, 366-370.
Ruricius of Limoges, his writings, II. 361.

Saadias, Gaon, his Arabic version of the Scriptures, I. 255.
Saadias Ben Levi Asnekoth, Rabbi, his Arabic version of Genesis, Psalms, and Daniel, I. 257-8.
Sabatier's Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus Italica, &c., I. 263, 264; II. 243.
Sahidic Version of the New Testament, II. 208, 209.
Sainthill, Richard, on numismatics, quoted, I. 35.
Salvian, Presbyter of Marseilles, his writings, II. 361.
Salomon Ben Melek, Rabbi, referred to, I. 409.
Σαμαρειτικὸν, I. 242.
Samaritan Pentateuch, its value and characteristic readings, I. 78-94, 102, 103; its antiquity, 94-101; its agreement with the Septuagint, 101-102; comparative value of its readings and those of the Hebrew Pentateuch, 89-94; when first printed, 101.
Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, I. 240-242.
Samaritan Writing, I. 20-22.
Samaritans, their origin and early history, I. 95-99.
Sangallensis, Codex, II. 313-316.
Sangermanenses, Codd. of the Latin version, II. 245, 247.
Sangermanensis Codex (E), II., 295, 296.
Santa Croce MS. the, quoted, II. 410.
Schaaf, his Syriac Testament, II. 164, 176, 177.
Schelhorn's Amoenitates Litterariae, I. 280.
Schiede's Observ. Sacr. biga referred to, I. 327, 335.
Schlichting referred to, II. 373.
Schnurrer's Dissertationes Philologico-Criticae referred to, I. 332, 333.
Scholiast or critic in relation to Hebrew MSS., I. 335.
Scholz's Einleitung, I. 211, 248; classification of MSS. of the Greek Testament, II. 82; Greek Testament described, 134-138; Curae Criticae, 304; Biblisch-Kritische Reise, 229; referred to, 437.
Schwarze, his edition of the Memphitic version of the New Testament, II. 210.
Scrivener, quoted, II. 142, 170, 192.
Sedulius, his writings, II. 361.
Seidel, Erasmus, referred to, II. 300.

Seidelii, Codices, II. 299-302.
Semler, quoted, II. 71; Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, 295.
Septuagint, The, origin and history of, I. 163-174; character of, 174, 181-183, 192; by different translators, 180; hypotheses as to its source and origin, 184-191; its value, 194; was read in some synagogues, 195, 196; esteemed by the Jews, 197; Origen's labours on it, 200-207; other labourers on its text, 207-208; its departures from the Hebrew, 209, 210; apocryphal additions to it, 210, 211; principal MSS. of it, 211; printed editions of it, 211-214.
Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, his writings, II. 344.
Severus, Bishop of Antioch, his works, II. 349.
Shemitic languages, their grammatical character and division, I. 10-12; alphabet of, 24, 25, &c.
Shickhard's Jus Regium Hebraeorum, I. 323.
Silvestrius, II. 240.
Simon's Histoire Critique du vieux Testament, referred to, I. 70, 247.
Simonis's edition of the Hebrew Bible, I. 150.
Sinaiticus, Codex, II. 317.
Sionita, Gabriel, II. 174, 223.
Sirach, Jesus the Son of, I. 177.
Siricius, his writings, II. 361.
Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulgate, I. 278-283.
Sixtus V. Pope, his revision of the Latin Vulgate, I. 277, 278.
Slavonic version of the New Testament, II. 238-240.
Smith, Dr. W., his dictionary of Greek and Roman biography and mythology, referred to, II. 252.
Smith, Dr. J. Pye, his Scripture Testimony, quoted, II. 397.
Smith, Dr. G., Bishop of Victoria, on the Jews at K'ae-fung-foo, I. 368, 369.
Socrates of Constantinople, his writings, II. 348.
Sopher, or Scribe of Hebrew MSS., I. 332.
Sources of criticism in the N. T., II. 1; their application, 374-381.
Sources of criticism in the O. T., I. 4; their application, 382-387.
Sozomen of Constantinople, his writings referred to, II. 348.
Speculum of Augustine, the so called, II. 409, 410.
Spohn's edition of Woide's prolegomena to the cod. Alex. II. 274.
Steinschneider referred to, I. 45, 46, 47, 115.
Stephens, Robert, author of chapters and verses in the Greek Testament, II. 21; editions of his Greek Testament, 111, 113-115.
Stephens, Henry, his editions of the Greek Testament, II. 119.
Steudel referred to, I. 100.
Stichometry and στίχοι, II. 14-17.
Stirnhielm, G. referred to, II. 230.
Storr's observationes super N. T. Versionibus Syriacis, II. 193; Dissertat. Inaug. Crit. de Evangeliis Arabicis, 224.

Stosel, II. 291.
Stroth's Repertorium, I. 218.
Stuart, Professor, referred to, I. 100; his critical history and defence of the Old Testament, 105; on the origin of the Pentateuch, 186; on Psalm xxii. 17, 408; on 1 Tim. 3, 16, II. 403.
Stunica referred to, II. 419, 420.
Subscriptions to the Books of the New Testament, II. 21.
Suidas, the Lexicographer, referred to, II. 351.
Συναξάριον, what, II. 20.
Syncellus, George, his Chronicon, II. 350.
Syncellus, his Chronographia, I. 208.
Synopsis of Sacred Scripture, the, attributed to Athanasius, II. 348.
Syriac, the Peshito version of the Old Testament, I. 243-254; of the New Testament, II. 58, 60, 150-184; the Philoxenian, 184-194; other Syriac versions, 195-201.

Talmud, the Babylonian, what, I. 115; quoted, 20, 21, 30, 49, 50, 229, 315; the Jerusalem, 115, 116, 195, 196.
Tam and Velshe Hebrew characters, the, I. 336.
Tanchum, Rabbi, referred to, I. 409.
Targum, meaning of the word, I. 227.
Targums, their origin, I. 224-229; Targum of Onkelos, 229-232; of Jonathan, 232-234; of Pseudo-Jonathan, 234-236; of Jerusalem, 236; Targums on the Hagiographa, 237-239.
Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, his works, II. 350.
Tatian referred to, II. 337.
Tertullian, quoted or referred to, I. 195, 196; II. 40, 46, 48, 49, 50, 59, 411, 412; his writings, 361.
Testament, the Greek, editions of, II. 106-149.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs referred to, II. 337.
Tetrapla of Origen, I. 201.
Text, of the Old Testament, external form, I. 56-63; unprinted text, 64-136; printed, 137-161.
Text, of the New Testament, external form, II. 13-22; the canon, 30-38; unprinted text, 39-87; printed, 106-149.
Thalassius, a Lybian Monk, his writings, II. 350.
Thenius, his Die Bücher der Koenige erklärt, &c., I. 380.
Theodore the Egyptian, his writings, II. 344.
Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea, his works, II. 344.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, his writings, II. 344; quoted, 387.
Theodore Studites, his writings, II. 350.
Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, his writings, II. 347; quoted, 393.
Theodotus, Bishop of Ancyra, his writings, II. 348; quoted, 389.
Theodotus (of the 2d century) referred to, II. 337.
Theodotion's Greek Version of the Old Testament, I. 217-219.

Theodulus, (Thomas Magister), referred to, II. 353.
Theophanes, a Sicilian Bishop, his writings, II. 352.
Theophilus of Alexandria, his writings, II. 344.
Theophilus of Antioch referred to, II. 336.
Theophylact, Bishop of Bulgaria, his writings, II. 352.
Thiersch De Pentateuchi Versione Alexand. I. 175, 176.
Tholuck's Auslegung der Bergpredigt, referred to, II. 430.
Thomson, Dr. James, referred to, II. 108.
Thornedyke, Herbert, referred to, I. 253.
Tichonius, the African, his writings, II. 361.
Timotheus of Alexandria, his works, II. 345.
Tischendorf, his edition of the LXX. I. 213, 214; classification of Greek MSS. of the New Testament, II. 84, 103, 104; editions of his Greek Testament, 143, 144; Monumenta Sacra inedita, 144, 281, 297, 303; Evangelium Palatinum ineditum, 243; Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, 285; Prolegomena in Cod. Claromont. 290, 291, 292, 296, 441; referred to, 280, &c.
Tischendorfianus, Codex, II. 316.
Titles of the New Testament Books, II. 20.
Τίτλοι, II. 17.
Titus of Bostra, his writings, II. 345.
Todrosius, his critical labours on the Pentateuch, I. 151.
Toepler, De Pentateuchi interpretat. Alexand. indole critica et hermen. referred to, I. 412.
Toletanus, Codex, II. 256.
Tregelles, Dr. S. P., referred to, II. 104, 142, 144; his critical edition of the Apocalypse quoted, 117; his forthcoming critical edition of the Greek Testament, 146.
Tremellius, his edition of the Peshito Syriac New Testament, II. 170-172.
Trent, the Council of, pronounces the Latin Vulgate authentic, I. 275-276.
Trost, Martin, his edition of the Peshito Syriac New Testament, II. 174.
Turton bishop, referred to, II. 425.
Twells, Dr. Leonard, referred to, II. 123.
Tychsen, referred to, I. 138; his Tentamen de Variis Codicum Hebraicorum Vet. Test. MSS. generibus, 190, 191, 333, 403.

Ulphilas, his Gothic version of the New Testament, II. 230, &c.
Uncial MSS. of the Greek Testament, II. 262; description of, 271-317.
Uscan, his edition of the Armenian version of the New Testament, II. 218.
Ussher on the origin of the Pentateuch, I. 100-101.

Valckenaer's Diatribe de Aristobulo cited, I. 173.
Valentinus referred to, II. 336.
Valerian, Bishop in the Maritime Alps, his writings, II. 362.

Valla Laurentius, his Variae lectiones referred to, II. 422.
Vallarsi, his edition of Jerome's Works, II. 255.
Van der Hooght's Hebrew Bible, I. 149.
Van Ess, Leander, his Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata, referred to, I. 262, 276, 279.
Various readings in the Old Testament, their sources, I. 65-71; specimens of, derived from versions, 288-293; in the New Testament, their sources, II. 23-29.
Vaticanus, Codex, II. 275-281.
Vaticanus, Codex S., II. 309, 313.
Vaticanus, Codex (r) II. 313.
Venetian-Greek Version, I. 222-223.
Vercellensis, Codex, II. 244.
Veronensis, Codex, II. 245.
Verses and chapters, division of the New Testament into, II. 21.
Verschuir's Dissertationes Philolog. I. 89.
Versions of the Old Testament, Greek, I. 162-223; Targums, 224-239; Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, 240-242; Peshito Syriac, 243-254; Arabic, 255-260; Persian, 260; Latin, 261-284; remarks on, and critical application of, 285-293.
Versions of the New Testament, the Peshito, II. 150-183; versions made from it, 183; the Philoxenian, 185-194; other Syrian versions, 195-201; Ethiopic, 202; Egyptian, 206-214; Armenian, 215-220; Georgian, 221; Persian, 221; Arabic, 222-219; Gothic, 230-237; Sclavonic, 238-240; Latin, 240-258; Observations on, 250, &c.; rules for their use, 260.
Victor of Antioch, his Commentary on Mark, referred to, II. 348.
Victor of Tunis, his works, II. 362.
Victor Vitensis, his writings, II. 362.
Victorinus Philosophus, his writings, II. 362.
Vigilius of Tapsus in Africa, his writings, II. 362; quoted, 415, 417.
Vindobonensis, Codex, II. 245.
Vitre, Anthony, Editor of the Paris Polyglott, II. 227.
Vloten's, Van, specimen Philologicum continens descriptionem Codicis MS. Bibliothecae Lugduno-Batavae, I. 259.
Vowel points, Hebrew, I. 37-55.
Vulgate, the Latin, text of, till the invention of printing, I. 270-273; printed editions, 273-284; pronounced authentic by the Council of Trent, 275, 276.

Wakefield's Translation of the New Testament, II. 443.
Walton, quoted, I. 6, 101, 253; II. 119, 174, 226.
Warka, the first translator of the Bible into Arabic, I. 255.
Wetstein, John James, his Greek Testament, II. 124-127, 236; Libelli ad crisin atque interp. Nov. Test., 370.

White, Professor, his edition of the Philoxenian Syriac New Testament, II. 188, 189, 193.
Wheloc and Pierson's edition of the Persian Gospels, II. 222.
Wichelhaus, De Novi Test. Versione Syriaca antiqua, &c. referred to, II. 155, 159, 163, 164, 173.
Widmanstadt's Peshito Syriac Testament, II. 167-170.
Wilkins' edition of the Memphitic version of the New Testament, II. 209, 210.
Winer, De versionis Pentateuchi Samaritanae indole, I. 240, 241; Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, II. 9, 11, 401; De Versionibus N. T. Syriacae usu critico caute instituendo, 159.
Wiseman's Horae Syriacae referred to, I. 245, 246, 251, 252; II. 188; Two letters on 1 John v. 7, 243, 409.
Woide referred to, II. 208, 273, 274.
Wolfii Bibliotheca Hebraea, I. 128, 325; Anecdota Graeca, II. 302; Curae Philologicæ, 424.
Wright, Dr., quoted, II. 22.
Writing materials employed by the New Testament writers, II. 13.

Ximenes, Cardinal, references to, I. 141, 142, 274; II. 106.

Yeates, Thomas, his collation of an Indian copy of the Hebrew Pentateuch, I. 368.

Zahn, J. Ch. referred to, II. 231, 236.
Zeno, Bishop of Verona, II. 362.
Zoega, his Catalogus Codd. Copt. MSS. Musei Borgiani, referred to, II. 213.
Zohrab, Dr., his critical edition of the Armenian version of the New Testament, II. 219.
Zonaras of Constantinople, his writings, II. 352.
Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, his Epistles referred to, II. 362.
Zunz, his Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, cited, I. 228.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY R. AND R. CLARK.

BS525 .D25 v.2
A treatise on Biblical criticism
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00011 3433